

A L  
V I N D I C A T I O N

O F

Dr. Sherlock,  
*1702*

Dean of St. Pauls,

In ANSWER to

Mr. Nathaniel Taylor's late  
Treatise, entitul'd, Dr. Sher-  
lock's Case of Church Commu-  
nion, and his Letter to Ano-  
nymus, consider'd, &c.

Together with

A Reply to his Vindication of the Dis-  
senters from the Charge of Schism.

By Mr. Hoadley

L O N D O N:

Printed for Tim. Childe, at the White Hart at the West-end  
of St. Paul's Church-yard. 1702.



25 101

---

---

# TO THE READER.

Reader,

**T**HIS Reply was drawn up, and thus directed to Mr. Taylor, before there was the least Suspicion of his death. It was a long time before any return to such a Book was thought necessary: which was the only Reason why this did not show it self sooner. But when it appear'd that some were so weak as to triumph in that Performance of his, it was judg'd proper that something should be said to it, that the World might see whether Mr. Taylor were really so very terrible an Adversary, or the cause of the Dissenters so very good a Cause. If the Publication of it since He is now dead, needs any Apology, I think it a sufficient one, that here is very little personal in it, hardly any notice taken of his Heat and Passion, his uncharitable Censures, or those Indecencies which his very Friends must own are spread through his Treatise: Nor any thing done here, but his Arguments fairly, and honestly stated and examin'd. As this Reply was not at first design'd to triumph over a living Man, so neither is it now publish'd to triumph over the Memory of a dead Man, but to an-

sver his Reasonings. If you think it worth your while to lay his Book before you, you will see whether I follow him closely, whether I deal fairly with him, whether I represent his Arguments honestly, and whether I make sufficient returns to them. And after you have consider'd the Matter, I must leave you to judge whether Mr. Taylor's Reasonings can be defended by the Laws of Logic, any more than his whole Behaviour in this Cause, by the Rules of the Gospel. I hope, I have transgress'd neither; tho', I confess, I could have been tempted to some Indecencies, when I met with such Unchristian Usage of a Person, whose whole Life hath been one continued Endeavour to serve the Christian Cause, and whose admirable Writings have procured Him so universal and establish'd a Reputation.

Mr. Taylor's Preface is fill'd with two Complaints, manag'd with abundance of Heat and Fire. His first Complaint is, That the Dissenters have been charged with Rebellion. Here I desire you would observe, he produces no Authors that charge this upon them, nor any of the Reasons why this was ever charg'd upon them. He says indeed it was because they could not swallow the Doctrine of Absolute Non-resistance, &c. But he knows this Charge hath been of a very long date, and was first grounded on those unspeakable Miseries, that Civil War, that horrid Murder of a good Prince, that breach in our Constitution, which some Men's Principles defended and brought about.

about. However Mr. Taylor confesses this Charge is laid aside, and hath been for many years. Where then, say I, is his love to Peace, or desire of Christian Unity, to revive the Discourse of it with so much Violence and Passion? Tho' I must observe that this Charge still remains upon those on whom it was at first justly fixt, and upon the Principles that brought such Confusion and Calamities upon the Nation. But, Reader, the Designs Mr. Taylor appears to have had in mentioning it were these, 1. That he might give himself occasion to abuse Dr. Sherlock, to quote, and interpret, and represent him as he pleas'd: A Design, which I think I may say (without the Imputation of Censoriousness) he prosecutes from beginning to ending, without Sincerity, Charity, or Decency. And, 2. That he might insinuate that all who have not embraced those Notions of the Non-conformists about Government on which the Charge of Rebellion had been formerly founded, could not be hearty Friends to their Country, or good Subjects to King William: When yet nothing is more apparent than these following Things, 1. That those who ran farthest from their loose Principles founded all their Notions upon this one thing, The Peace and Advantage of the Society they belong'd to; and always argued from thence. 2. That the Principles which first gave occasion to the Charge of Rebellion are as bad as ever, and may be abhorr'd as justly

by

by the best Subjects, as by the greatest Enemies King William ever had. 3. That they who come over to a Government now establish'd, tho' they do not like the Methods by which it was establish'd, and bring over with them their Principles of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance are as good Subjects, and ought to be so accounted as those whose Obedience is founded on any other Reason. And, 4. That those Men's Principles cannot be thought the most for the Interest of this Country, whose Practices have been the cause of such irreconcileable Divisions and Heats in it. But enough of this, which I should never have touch'd upon, had not Mr. Taylor's intemperate Pen unavoidably led me to it.

His Second Complaint, and that upon which he chiefly founds the necessity of his late appearance in Print, is, That several Persons among the Conformists (whom he names and passes what Censure he pleases upon) and especially, The Authors of the London Cases, have endeavour'd to show that the Separation the Dissenters have made from the Church of England is an unreasonable, unnecessary, and therefore sinful Separation: And that one of them, in particular, has endeavour'd to prove, That Schismaticks from a particular sound Church, are Schismaticks from the Catholick Church: Which Proposition why it should incense our Dissenters, who will never grant themselves Schismaticks from a particular Church, I cannot tell, unless they are inwardly conscious

scious they are so. This is the true State of the Case, which Mr. Taylor, in his healing and peaceful way of Speaking, calls throwing the Dissenters heaps upon heaps into Hell, and I know not what. But where is the Crime of these Authors? Are they to suffer their People to be drawn from them, and not to open their Mouths? Or, Is it a Crime to do this with Christian Temper and Calmness, as they did? This Charge against the Dissenters does, I confess, still remain, and whether Mr. Taylor hath demonstrated it to be groundless and unreasonable, must be left to others to judge. If I had thought he had, I'm sure I should not have endeavour'd to have shown the contrary.

The Chapters in this Reply answer exactly to Mr. Taylor's. In the Eight first is contain'd the Vindication of the Dean of St. Paul's: And in these, He gives me leave to say, I have represented his Sense truly. In the Ninth and last Chapter Mr. Taylor's Principles of Separation, or the Arguments on which his Vindication of the Dissenters is founded, are stated, and examin'd: And in this, I hope, I have said nothing that any Conformist ought to disown. If you should think that I fall upon the Matter in hand too abruptly, and pursue it too intently, I desire you to remember, that tho' this is a way of managing Controversies least of all for the Pleasure and Diversion of many Readers, yet that it is also least of all liable to a just Offence, because most guarded from Unchristian and Unmanly Indecencies.

## A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

*Lately Printed for Tim. Childe, at the White-Hart  
at the West-end of St. Paul's Church-yard.*

**A** Letter to Mr. Fleetwood, occasion'd by his late Essay on Miracles. *Quarto.*

Some Thoughts on a Convocation, and the Notion of its Divine Right. With some Occasional Reflections on *The Defence of the Vindication of the Depriv'd Bishops.* Written by Mr. R. West. *Quarto.*

The Essays or Councils, Civil and Moral, of Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, Vicount St. Albans. With a Table of the Colours of Good and Evil, and a Discourse of the Wisdom of the Ancients. Newly Reprinted with Addition of the Character of Queen Elizabeth. *Octavo.*

The English Historical Library, Part Third. Giving an Account of our Records, Law-books and Coins, from the Conquest to the End of Queen Elizabeth's Reign: So far as they are serviceable to History. By W. Nicolson Arch-deacon of Carlile. *Octavo.*

The Scottish Historical Library: Containing a short View and Character of most of the Writers, Records, Registers, Law-books, &c. which may be serviceable to the Undertakers of a General History of Scotland, down to the Union of the Two Kingdoms in King James VI. By W. Nicolson Arch-deacon of Carlile. *Octavo.*

---

### E R R A T A.

Page 36 l. 27. r. *Toleration*; p. 55. l. 12. r. *Burial*; p. 58. l. 23. dele to  
p. 66. l. 8. r. *advise.*

---

# A DEFENCE OF Dr. SHERLOCK, &c. In ANSWER to Mr. TAYLOR.

---

## C H A P. I.

**Y**OUR first Chapter is rather an endeavour to prejudice your Reader against the Dean, as a Person utterly uncapable of writing common Sense clearly and consistently, than to propose any thing that has the least relation to the main Design of your Book. But because you think You have advanced somewhat that looks like a Proof of this Charge, my purpose of following you, where ever you have any thing that has but the face of an Argument, obliges me to consider it.

The first Instance you produce relates to the *Description* the Dean gives the World of a Church. So he calls it

more than once, and what Authority you have to call it a *Definition* I know not. If you are so exact a Logician as you pretend every where to be, and so nice in the signification of Words as you would have the World think you are by this Chapter, you know there is some difference between a *Description* and *Definition*. The *Description* the Dean gives of a *Church* is this, That it is a *Body, or society of Men separated from the rest of the World, and united to God, and to themselves, by a divine Covenant.* Your chief cavil upon this Head, besides those reserved for another Chapter, is this ; *That the Dean does not give warning before-hand what Church,* of that long Catalogue you produce, *He means.* Indeed you grant that one that reads the Dean's Discourse, would be inclin'd to suppose that *He intends it as a description of a Church in the general Notion of it.* It would be very hard if he should not, and the fault must lie in his own want of understanding and not in the Dean's want of clearness. When a Writer says expressly he will explain *what is meant by a Church, and a Christian Church, i. e. what is meant by a Christian Church.* p. 1. When *He* first gives a description of a *Church*, p. 1. and some time after tells us what the *Christian Church* is, p. 5. when *He* instances in the *Jewish* as well as *Christian Church* in his explication of this *description*, p. 3, 5. when this *description* was premis'd in order to settle the nature of the *one Christian Church* dispers'd thro' the whole World ; When a Writer I say, has done all this, and more, *one would (as you say) be inclin'd to suppose He mean't a Church in the general notion of it* ; unless one was resolv'd not to understand the plainest words.

But still you are sure there is somewhat amiss here, for (p. 3.) *This clear Writer* (so you are pleas'd to call the *Dean*) *never tells us what the Catholick Church is, nor what the Church of England is, nor wherein either the one or the other of these are distinguish'd from a Church in the general Notion of it.* This is strange indeed, when first *He* describes a *Church in the general notion*, and (p. 5.) in plain words describes the *Christian Church*

*Church to be that Society of Men that is in Covenant with God, thro' Christ.* No one can understand any thing by the Christian Church here, but the Universal Christian Church; and if the last words *thro' Christ* are not sufficient to show wherein the Christian Church is distinguish'd from a Church in the general notion of it, then no words can do it. So that here is a distinct and clear account of what the Catholic Christian Church is, and how it is distinguish'd from a Church in the general notion of it ; or rather, if we would speak more exactly than you yourself do, how it is distinguish'd from other Churches. But the Dean does not tell you *what the Church of England is, and how that is distinguish'd, &c.* But, does He not tell you what is sufficient to all the purposes of that discourse of His ? Is it not clear from ev'ry Page almost of it, that he looks upon the Church of England as a part of that Society dispers'd thro' the World, as a Member of that one Body of Christ, the one Universal Church ? as that part of it which we say is establish'd in *England*, under the government of Bishops ? as that part of it from which you have separated ? and I suppose there needed no such nice and distinct Form of words to tell you which that was.

But you proceed, Tea, one would think that he denied that there were any particular Church at all (p. 3.) as the Reader may see at his leisure. The Absurdity you charge the Dean with here is, that he says, *There is but one Church, one body of Christ : And yet He himself calls particular Churches, Churches.* Now, who that was not resolv'd to endeavour to make his Adversary ridiculous, rather than answer his Arguments, would have brought such Trifles as this into the Dispute ? If you have read the Discourse you oppose, You must know that it was the Dean's design to observe, that the Church of Christ is one, as the Body of Christ can be but one, and to make this plain to the meanest understandings ; that tho' there are and must be particular parts of this Church, as

there must be distinct Congregations of Christians, yet that there is but one Church, one body of Christ. All this does not hinder in the least but that He may conform himself to the usual ways of expression, and call these particular parts of the one Church, Churches, without that gross Contradiction you think you have discover'd. Nor does He want your help to bring him off, who (as in many other places, so here particularly) first mistake Him, and then frame such Answers for Him, as you can shew your Wit most upon. Who do's not see that when the Dean says, *This Church can't be divided into two or more Churches*, He means this as an observation on the unity of the Church instituted by God; and an observation not wholly useless, but level'd against such Persons as were so weak as to think that *two Churches* which were not Members of each other could both be the *Churches of Christ*. This He expresses more plainly (Case p. 8.) where he explains *distinct and separate Churches* to be *Churches that are not Members of each other*. So that what he says may be reduc'd to this. There is but one Body of Christ, but one Church. Two distinct Societies of Men (called Churches) which are not in Communion with, or Members of, each other, cannot be both of them *Bodies of Christ*, because Christ can have but *one Body*: And they cannot both of them make up this one Body, because they are not Members of each other; so that He do's not deny, but that the Church may be divided into two or more particular Churches (as they are commonly call'd) which are Members one of another: But his plain design is to observe, that two particular Churches (as they are called) that are not Members of each other, can neither be two Bodies of Christ, nor both together constitute the one Body of Christ. Now, Instead of the sense you have affixed to the Dean's words out of your own head (p. 5.) pray take this, *The Universal Church can't be divided into, or can't be made up of, particular, distinct, separate Churches, not Members of each other;*

and

and try again what monstrous Absurdity there is in this: for the Absurdity you have already discover'd is founded upon your own Words, and not the Dean's; and so is an Absurdity of your own making, design'd as one would think to give your self an opportunity of being witty. And, because the Dean's Absurdity in another of his Writings is brought in to grace your Triumph, I must, contrary to my design, stop to tell you, that a Man so skill'd in Logic as you are, unless he was determin'd to think and say any thing to his Adversary's discredit, would rather think *Universal Parts*, an error of the Press, for *Univocal Parts*, especially when in the same Sentence they are explain'd to be *Parts that have the same Nature with the whole*; than draw it in hither to make your Charge of *Absurdity* and *Nonsense* look the more substantial: And so I assure you it is corrected in several Copies of that Book you quote for it, and has been, ever since the Book was Printed.

But you proceed to examine the Proof He proposes of this Paradox (as you call it) and that is this, *It is extremely absurd and unreasonable, to say that the Christian Church, which is built upon the same Foundation, and hath the same Faith, the same Promises, the same Privileges, should be divided into as distinct, and separate Bodies, tho' of the same kind and nature, as Peter, James, and John are distinct Persons, tho' they partake of the same common Nature.* And the Dean explains himself in the next Words, *That is, it is very absurd to say, that where every thing is common, there is not one Community.* And the Sentence is concluded with words as plain, *That where there is nothing to distinguish and separate, no Enclosures or Partitions of Divine appointment, there can be, by divine Institution, but one Body.* Where it is evident, he is speaking of the *Church*, consider'd as constituted by *Christ*, as the *Body of Christ*, as a Society constituted by *divine Appointment*, made up of parts which must be Members one of another, in order to constitute this one Body; and therefore consequently, not

di.

divisible into distinct and separate Parts, not Members one of another. This is plainly the Dean's meaning, which You either misunderstand, or misrepresent when you come to make your Comments upon it. For instance, you say, *it is plain from hence, that there cannot be two or more particular and numerically distinct Churches,* in the Dean's opinion : And then you run on, *we must no more say, the Church of Geneva, the Church of England, &c.* I dare assure you that it was not the Dean's design to regulate the common Forms of expression in the World, which He himself complies with thro' this whole Discourse, much less was it in his thoughts to teach the niceties of Language to so great a Master of it as you have shew'd your self. But if you mean by *particular, and numerically-distinct Churches,* parts that constitute the one Body of Christ, and are Members one of another, the Dean is as far from saying what you charge him with, as you are : But if you understand by *distinct Churches, separate Bodies, or Societies of Men, not Members one of another,* as you ought to do if you would oppose Him in this, then He does say it : And it is so plain a truth, that He only mentions the contrary as an Absurdity apparent at first sight.

Again, from hence, you say, *according to our Authour, the Church of Geneva, of Holland, of Rome, and of England have nothing at all to distinguish them from each other ; they have all things common, they have no peculiar Privileges, and therefore they are, and can be but one Church ;* and then you learnedly observe their Ecclesiastical Polity to be sufficient to distinguish them. p. 6, 7. But how this can be any thing to your purpose I cannot see. The Dean is observing, that the one Society, the one Body of Christ, cannot be made up of parts as distinct from one another as Peter, James and John, who are not Members one of another. He is speaking of this Church consider'd as constituted what it is by divine Appointment, and proving it one Body by the institution of Christ

Christ. And from hence you gather, that He thinks particular parts of this Society, which have all things common, that is, all things of divine Appointment, all things essential to make them parts of the one Christian Church (for it is of such things only he is speaking) may not have several things to distinguish them from each other, not of divine Appointment, not appointed by God as Essential to a Church. Till you can produce somewhat appointed by God as Essential to a Church, and shew that they differ from one another in the possessing, or not possessing this; and also prove notwithstanding this, that ev'ry one of them are *churches*, true *Parts of the Universal Society of Christians* (which is impossible) you argue against your self and not against the Dean. But you have not yet done with this Argument, for you quote a Book of the Dean's, not from your own sight it seems, but as you find it quoted by Mr. Baxter; in which you say, *He has discover'd two Universal visible Churches, &c.* I suppose this is a piece of Mr. Baxter's Wit. What it was that gave him occasion to say so, the Reader may see at large in the *Vindication of the Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet*, not p. 164, as Mr. B. directs, but p. 64, 65, &c.

The next instance you give of the Dean's want of clearness, is only a *Cavil* against an Expression very frequently us'd by as good Writers as your self, very easily understood by ev'ry Reader, and therefore very allowable by all the rules of Language. And your Quotation out of the Scripture, and *Grotius's Note* upon it, only serve to shew, that there is the same obscure expression (as you call it) exactly both in Greek and Latin.

The last Proof you advance to make good the Title of this Chapter is taken from this Position, *That Church-communion, is Church-union.* (p. 9.) These words thus put together I find not in the Dean's Treatise; tho' I think, since it is the Dean you have fix't upon to oppose and indeed to abuse, that it is but just you should give your Reader his

own

own words. By Church-communion he says, is to be understood Church-fellowship, or Society : And, what Union is in natural Bodies, that Communion is in Bodies Politick. Case p. 10. Another Man, you say, would have thought Union something prerequisite to Communion. So it is plain the Dean does, when Communion is taken in the ordinary sense of the word, for a Personal and presential Communion in Christian Offices (Case p. 10.) and in this Sense he often uses it himself. But he may observe (for all that) that the true signification of the word Communion, is Fellowship, and Society, and so that Church-Communion is that Union to Christ, which is antecedent to the Exercise of Communion. Thus all your discourse about Tautology proves nothing to your purpose: tho' I must tell you (with your good leave) that there are Tautologies, which are not blameable, frequent in the best Writers, and, I believe, unavoidable in all. I will give you one instance taken out of an Authour, whom it is very plain you take for a great Master of Language. You your self have not wrote one Page farther than this, before you are guilty of it : For I take Writing after a perplex'd and intricate rate (as you speak p. 10.) to be neither better nor worse than, Writing after a perplex'd and perplex'd rate.

Thus have I follow'd you closely thro' this first Chapter. And now, if after I have Examin'd this threatening Beginning, I should tell the Reader (as you do of the Dean before you have Examin'd any one Argument of his, p. 2.) *That this is an Earnest of what we are to expect from you,* I should do much better than you did, and yet I think I should not do right neither. For we are not to prejudice the By-standers by any such Artifices against the Arguments we oppose. All that I design'd here, was to remove those Prejudices you have endeavour'd to cast in your Reader's way ; to shew him how little Reason you had to Triumph over the Dean as you do, before you come to consider his Arguments ; and to let him see that

he

he is not so Mean, so Absurd, so wretched a Scribler as you make him: And this Design I hope is Answered.

---

## C H A P. II.

**Y**Our second Chapter is an Examination of the Dean's Description of a Church, which is this, *A Body, or Society of Men separated from the rest of the World, and united to God, and to themselves, by a Divine Covenant.* Against which you Object. 1. That there is no mention of Jesus Christ in it: Nay, nor in the After-explications, but only once in this occasional Passage, viz. The Christian Church is nothing else but such a Society of Men as are in Covenant with God through Christ. That is, you are finding fault with the Dean for not mentioning Jesus Christ any where but where it was proper to mention him. Upon which I cannot help making this Reflexion, That some Men's Logick is good for little but to make themselves Ridiculous. For, if any Reader of common Sense could not see at first View, that the Dean first describes a Church in the general Notion of it, and that it would not be proper to mention Jesus Christ there, I am much mistaken. Nay, you your self who have discover'd that palpable Darkness in this Discourse which no Body else can see, do acknowledge p. 3. That one would be inclin'd to suppose it; and then I'm sure, one would be inclin'd to omit such Objections as this. And would not you think it very pretty, if the Dean had put Jesus Christ into this Description of a Church, and presently should Instance in the Jewish, as well as Christian Church, as agreeing in this general Notion, as he does in his Explication of it? But you say, You are glad to find his Name any where; but sure it

ought to be in the definition of a Church. I answer, so it is in his description of a Christian Church; but as it is not, so it ought not to be in the description of a Church under which the Christian Church is comprehended. You may call that *description of a Christian Church an occasional Passage*, if you please; As occasional as it is, it serves the purposes of that Discourse very well, and was design'd for a description of the Christian Church. The other was not, and yet you cavil, because Jesus Christ is not in it: This was, and if you could have show'd that Defect in this, it had been something to your purpose. You might then with a better Grace have talk'd about the nature of a *Definition*, and quoted St. Paul to shew that Christ ought not to be left out of his own Church.

But this is not all. For, 2dly, *If our Authour's definition be true, the Church of England is no true Church; nor can there be any such thing as a true National, Metropolitan, or Patriarchal Church.* This is very strange indeed: Then it must be for this reason, because, the Church of *England* is not part of a *Body or society of Men, united to God and themselves by a divine Covenant.* For, if it is, it must be a true Church according to this Definition; and when you have prov'd that it is not, then it will be time enough to answer this Objection. In the mean while, the Reader's time ought not to be spent in the considering what is wholly foreign to the Proof of this Assertion of yours: And it is a sufficient return to such Arguments, to shew they are wholly impertinent. This any one will quickly be satisfied of in the Objection now before us. For if there is any Argument in it, it must run thus. The Church of *England* both *diffusive and representative*, so also a Metropolitan and Patriarchal Church consider'd as such, have several things in their Constitution which all acknowledge to be of Humane institution;

There-

Therefore they cannot have what is, of divine Institution, essential to the making them Churches. Or, thus,

They have somewhat in their Constitution, as they are particular Churches, over and above that divine Covenant which is essential to a Church;

Therefore they cannot have that divine Covenant which makes them truly Churches of God: Or, therefore their Members cannot be united to God and themselves by a divine Covenant.

If there is no Consequence in this, then this Chapter cannot be to the purpose intended in it. And that there is none, I think cannot be made more plain than it is. For, what if there is somewhat in these Churches, consider'd as the Church of *England*, as a Metropolitan, or Patriarchal Church, over and above what is Essential to the being of a Church consider'd as instituted by God, can this prove that they cannot have what is Essential to make them Churches of God too? You may as well attempt to prove, that the Christian Church is not a Church according to this Description, because it has somewhat, as it is the Christian Church, over and above what is essential to a Church, according to that description of it in the general Notion. And so all your pains about the humane Institution of some Officers in the Church of *England* signify nothing, but to shew how wide a Man may Shoot of the Mark he pretends to have in his Eye. But I observe, you seem always very happy if you can but make the Dean Contradict himself, tho it be never so little to the advantage of your Cause. So here, after you have produc'd his Authority, that a *National*, and *Patriarchal Church*, as such, are of *Humane Institution*, you produce Words of his out of another of his Writings, in which he wonders why a *National and Patriarchal Church* should not be thought (upon the Account there mention'd) as much a *Divine Institution* as any particular Church. Def. of Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 259. where I find the Words you

quote: But the Words immediately going before will help to give some account of this great Contradiction. And they are these, *I observe, that tho' the Bonds and Combinations of several Churches are order'd and determin'd by Humane Prudence, yet they are founded on a Divine right.* The Unity of the Church is as much of Divine Right, as any Form of Government in it: And when the whole Church must be but one, it may be divided into greater or lesser Parts as may best serve the Preservation of Unity, Peace and Order, and the Edification of Christians. Then follows, when Christ hath instituted a Catholick Church, and Catholick Unity, it seems strange to me that a National and Patriarchal Church (which is only such a Combination of several Churches into one as may serve the ends of Catholick Unity) should not be thought as much a Divine Institution as any particular Church. What Contradiction here is, I profess I cannot see. The Bonds and Combinations of those Churches here mention'd are expressly said to be order'd and determin'd by Humane Prudence. This is no Contradiction I suppose to what you quoted before out of him. And for all this, these Churches, consider'd as such Combinations as may serve the ends of Catholick Unity (such they are in the Dean's Opinion, whatever they are in yours) may be thought of Divine Institution, as much as any particular Church. For no particular Church is so, but as it is a Member of the Universal Church, and serves the ends of Catholick Unity; and why these Combinations may not be so, under the same Consideration, He dos not know. So that the Dean does not say, *They are of Divine Institution, and all the Officers in them, consider'd as National or Patriarchal Churches,* which he must have done, if he had contradicted himself; but only consider'd as such Combinations of Churches as serve the Ends of the Catholick Church, and Catholick Unity instituted by Christ, which are two very different Things. Now let the Reader see if these two Propositions are not very consistent, *Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans,*

Chas:

Chancellours, Officials, Priests, &c. consider'd as one Body for the Government and Discipline of some combined Churches is of Humane Institution, and, A National Church consider'd as such a Combination of several Churches into one as may serve the ends of Catholick Unity, may be thought as much a Divine Institution as any particular Church.

You observe, by the way, what you call a Slip in the Dean, which you let pass as such. p. 18. that he says Bishops are not of Divine Institution; and this you insinuate as a Comment upon the Quotations you make out of his other Writings: Which makes me observe, by the way, that this is wholly a mistake of your own. For you can quote no such Sentence out of his Writings as this, *Bishops are not of Divine Institution*: That which you quote, and make this Remark upon, is wholly to another Purpose, viz. that *Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Prebends, Canons, Arch-Deacons, &c. this* (i. e. plainly, this Body of Officers thus United) *is only an Ecclesiastical Body of Humane Institution, &c.* it speaks not of any of 'em in particular, and separate from the rest, but of all of them, taken together, and consider'd as making up one Body. And, if you know any thing of that Book you quote for this (*Vindic. of some Protest. Principl.*) you must know that not two Pages before this you cite (viz. p. 10.) the Dean is considering the Church of England Doctrine of the Divine Institution of Episcopacy (which he asserts) and how much it was opposed in the Council of Trent.

And now, if this Chapter is a true Copy of your inward thoughts, I'm sure you are very unfit to oppose a Writer whose plain and manifest Sense you cannot understand. And if it is not, you are not a sincere and honest Adversary, to raise Objections which you know to be nothing to the purpose.

## C H A P. III.

**Y**O U R *Third Chapter* is directed against the *Church's Authority*, and particularly against that Position of the *Dean's*, *That every National Church has Authority over her own Members to prescribe the Rules of Worship*. Now I must beg leave to explain what I conceive to be meant by such Expressions as this, and then we shall the better judge of the force of those Arguments you produce against it. That the *Church of Christ*, and ev'ry part of it consists of *Governours and Governed*, of Persons that have some Authority, and Persons that are to obey this Authority, that these *Governors* are invested with this Authority, for the edification of the *Church*, for the good order and decency of the *Worship of God*, I think is plain. But whether it is so or no to you, I think this ought to be allowed by all (or else we can see no end of Heats, and Quarrels, and Separations) that wherever there is a *Christian Church* already constituted, and settled with Rules and Prescriptions for the *Worship of God* laid down by the *Governours of this Church*, there no *Christians* ought to separate from this *Church*, unless such things are required in order to their *Communion* with it, as they cannot agree to with a *safe Conscience*; because this is against the sacred *Laws of Peace and Union*. And consequently, that in a *Nation*, where there are several *Churches*, i. e. *Churches under several Governours*, combined together for good purposes; where these *Governours* have settled such and such *Laws and Prescriptions* for the greater Regularity and Uniformity of the *Publick worship of God*, No *Christian* ought to separate from such *Churches* so combined into one *Church*; but to acknowledge so much Authority in the *Governors of this Church*, as servcs very well the

the ends of Peace and Unity, and to obey this Authority, as this Church is a Member of that Body of Christ, whose Happiness, and Beauty He is bound to Consult. If You grant not thus much, I know not what Measures You can lay down, that will give the Christian Church such a Prospect of Peace and Concord, as ev'ry other Society in the World can have. And if You do grant but thus much, I believe there will no Dispute remain between You and the Dean about the Churches Authority.

The Design of this Proposition of the Dean's was to fix an Obligation to Peace and Unity, and Communion with that part of the Christian Church settled, where the Providence of God causes you to be Born ; I mean, if you can enjoy this Communion without sinning against your Conscience. And to fix this Obligation, whatever the Prince of the Country is, whether Heathen or Christian, whatever the Laws of the Land be, whether Encouraging the Church, or Persecuting it. Such an Obligation to Union there certainly is, and it must be founded upon such an Authority in the Governours of the Church necessary to the Edification and Peace of it. So that when we speak of the Authority of the Church, it is plain we understand such an Authority as I have Explain'd *in the Church*, i. e. in the Governours of it, and that consider'd as the Church of Christ, as his Body, and that Society, in some of the Members of which there must be as much Authority as conduces to the ends of Peace and Unity, and in others of which there ought to be as much Obedience as is necessary for the Preservation of Love and Concord. And I believe you will find it hard to name any part of the Church since the Apostle's Days, in which there was not thought to be so much Authority, and in which such Obedience was not thought necessary. That Obligation there is to have Communion with some part of the Christian Church, that unavoidable necessity of some Forms and

Pre-

Prescriptions in ev'ry part of it, (whether there is a Civil Power to Determine 'em or no) the indispensable Duty of ev'ry Christian to consult the Peace and Harmony of the whole, serve to make this plain, That *every Church has Authority over her own Members to prescribe Rules of Worship.* Let us see then what you have Objected against this, taking this along with us, That we do not speak of the Church's Authority here as derived from the Sanctions of the Civil Power, or Back'd by them; but wholly Separate from 'em, and consider'd as necessarily resulting from Christ's Institution of this one Society, in which, and in ev'ry part of which some such Authority is very necessary; and obedience to it as necessary as Peace and Union are, where it can be exercis'd without Sin.

Now, If we keep this in our mind, we shall see, that Your first Objection taken from the Novelty of this Doctrine is wholly grounded upon your mistaking the Question, and that Your Instance of the Recantation of Dr. *Smith* proves nothing, but that You have a very great Rarity by You, which You were resolv'd some how or other the World should know. You have not given us all that Rarity (for fear, I suppose, that it should be worth little when once made Publick) and so I know not what Judgment exactly to make of it. It seems to consider Princes as good, Christian Princes, and asserts their Authority Supreme in indifferent matters Ecclesiastical as well as Civil. But what is this to that Authority in the Church, which we assert, whether the Prince joyn his to it or no, whether He be a Christian or a Heathen? Yes, You'll say, But in the Church of *England* (about which our Discourse is now) the Prince's Authority is what obliges, not the Church's; for that has none. I do not think my self obliged here to enter into a Dispute about the King's Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Matters. It is enough to observe, That the Proposition you are now opposing, does not assert the Church's

Church's Authority, as the Church of *England* incorporated into the State, and under the Government of a Christian Prince ; but consider'd as a part of the Universal Church, as a Society in which, according to the very original Institution, there must be Governors, and Governed ; some to Rule, and some to Obey. Now supposing there is such an *Authority* originally in the *Church* (as there is in every well-regulated and uniform Society) what you produce will never prove any thing; but that You and several other Persons will not think fit to obey it, not only if it be oppos'd by the Civil Power, but except it be back'd by it ; and there must be an end of Peace and Union in the Church. But if there is such an *Authority*, it is very plain nothing can make it void ; and supposing that the Case should be worse with the *Church* in a Christian, than a Heathen Country, and the Authority of its Governors disregarded, but as it is strengthen'd by the Prince and his Authority, yet still the same Authority is in the Governors, tho' Obedience and Submission is not in the People : And I cannot think but that the Advices, the Resolutions, and Determinations of the Governors of the Church ought to be look'd on with great reverence and regard, tho' the *Church* were wholly independent on the State. And so it is to be hop'd they would, by a great Number of good Christians. But why should you pretend to swallow up the *Church's Authority* in the King's, as if you were willing to resign your selves to that, when you know you have not obey'd, when both *Church* and *State* have joyn'd their Authority to oblige you ? So that this is foul Play in You, however you may think it reflects upon the *Church of England*. If you could have shew'd from Antiquity, that Men have been severely Scourged for talking of such an *Authority* in the *Church of Christ*, or any part of it, as this ; that there was no such thing ever mention'd by the antient Christians, as

Obedience to the Governors of the Church in their Prescriptions about Worship, as Conformity to the Rules and Customs of the Church where you live ; nay, as complying with Rules and Forms, tho' ill contriv'd and burthensome, rather than separating Communions, and breaking the Peace of the Church ; then you might have argued with some Face from the *Novelty of this Position* : But as you have drawn up your Objection, it is indeed a gross Mistake of the Point in Question.

But I must proceed to your other Objections. After you have observed that this *Church of England*, about whose Authority you dispute, must be either the *Diffusive* or *Representative* : And after you have remark'd that this Authority cannot be in the *Diffusive*, i. e. in that part of the Church which is to be *Govern'd*, you labour to prove that it cannot be in the *Representative*, p. 24. And that,

First, Because what is call'd so, is not the *Church-representative*, according to Dr. *Sherlock's* way of arguing against the *Church of Rome*. Now all that you do or can produce out of the Dean is, *That no Persons can represent those who have not given their Consent they should be their Representatives : And that no Company of Christians, less than the whole, can represent the whole, and have that Authority when they are met together, which the whole Number of Christians in the World are pretended to have, under no consideration, but as they are the whole Number.* And I think it is pretty plain, that any Number, which is not the whole, cannot possibly represent the whole (so as to have the Authority of it) any particular Person of which whole, has no Authority to resign to his Representative ; nay, which has not any Authority but as it is the *Whole*. This is what the Dean says, as will appear to any who consults the Book and Page you quote ; and I hope some will be at that Pains, that they may see how fair an Adversary you are, what material

Words

Words you can leave out, and that they may read this Sentence at the end of the Words you quote, *It is a different Case indeed, when every particular Man has an original Right and Share in the Power, and the whole Power is not formally seated in the whole Body, for then it may by common Consent be contracted, &c.* Well, from hence, if you would argue to your Purpose, you should argue, That therefore, Bishops, Deans, Arch-Deacons, can't represent themselves; therefore Presbyters can't represent those Presbyters who give them their Consent, and are willing to be represented by them. The *Canon* says no more than this, when it says the *Convocation* is the *Church-representative*, as I know of, tho' you are pleas'd to make it the *Representative of the People* (as well as of the *Clergy*) who seem to have no right to have any hand in *Convocation-Business*, nor to have any Notion that they are *represented* there, unless you have discover'd it to them. The *Canon* says no more than this, I say, and the Dean says nothing that contradicts this so much as in appearance.

But, Secondly, You argue from the *odd Constitution of this Church-representative*. But, I pray, Is this tolerable Argument? The *Governors of the Church* combined together, have no such Authority, as the *People*, under their several Inspections, ought to obey, because when they meet in *Convocation*, some meet in concert with them, who are not Officers of Divine Appointment, or because there are but Thirty Eight to represent the inferior *Clergy*, or because these are chosen, out of a greater Number return'd, by the *Bishops*, or because these *Bishops* are nam'd by the *King*? This *Constitution* may be *odd*, but this way of arguing is much more so. And then to insinuate, That any Body ever thought this *Convocation*, because it is call'd the *Church-representative*, or the *Representative of the Clergy*, founded upon a Divine *Covenant*; or to

think that this will follow from the Dean's *Description of a Church*, is below a Man of Understanding.

But Thirdly, Dr. *Sherlock*, it seems, tells you, *That the Bishops, when assembled together, have no governing Power at all.* They lose it all then, as soon as they are met. For, I'm sure, in the Words you quote out of Him just before, He says, *The Office of a Bishop is not to represent, but to govern*; and in many other Places of his Works: And, I doubt, in the Words you quote out of him here, we shall find still more Instances of some defect in your self, rather than of Contradiction in Him. Your Busines is to prove, *That Bishops, when assembled, have no Governing Power*, which their *People* are obliged to Obey. You prove it from *Dr. Sherlock's Vindic. of some Prot. Princip.* p. 27. &c. where, in as plain Words as can be, he speaks of *Bishops* meeting together to consult about the good *Government* of their *Dioceſes*, how to exercise that Power they have to the best Advantage: And then follows, that *these Councils of Bishops are not originally for direct Acts of Government and Superiority over each other, but only for mutual Counsel and Advice*: Where I desire the Reader to observe these Words, *originally, direct, over each other*, which you have thought fit to omit; and to call to Mind the Subject of this part of that Treatise, and then let him wonder, how it can follow from hence, *That Bishops, when met together, have no Authority over the People of their several Dioceſes*, which was the Thing to be prov'd; or that when there is such a Combination of Churches settled, as the National one is, and such an Agreement and Consent of Bishops in some Forms and Prescriptions, the *People* of their several *Dioceſes* are not obliged to conform to these Rules. Another thing the Dean is here charg'd with, is, *Destroying the King's Authority in Ecclesiastical Affairs*; because he says, *The Bishop is Supreme in his own Dioceſe*: Or, as he expresses it in another Sentence you quote in this same

same Page, *That there is no superior Authority in the Church over Bishops.* But you ought to have consider'd, and have let your Reader know it too, that in that Book, he is treating of Bishops, only with respect to one another, to that Authority, some assert, one Bishop or more may have over others; concerning himself only with the *Church*, which he is careful to mention, not considering the Authority of the *State*, in a Country wholly Christian, it being quite foreign to the Subject he was then upon. What was plainly intended in all the Passages you produce to this purpose, was, That no Bishop, or Council of Bishops had any direct Authority over another Bishop, or any thing to do with the Government of his Diocese; and how that destroys the *King's Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Affairs*, let the Reader judge.

Once more, the Dean is made to contradict his own Assertion about the *Authority of the National Church*, when he says, *He sees no Hurt, if every Bishop should have a peculiar Liturgy for his own Church.* But I do not think it a hard Thing to reconcile these two Propositions, if you do. *In a National Church, in which Diocesan Churches are combined, and their Bishops meet to consult and advise with one another, and prescribe for the good Government of their Churches;* *In such a Church every Bishop may have a Liturgy of his own, without any hurt, tho' it is better they should use the same.* And, *In ev'ry such Church, in which the Bishops meet and consult together, they have Authority to prescribe Rules of Worship, and the People ought to conform themselves to these Prescriptions.* I see nothing like a Contradiction in them. And having thus gone thro' this Objection, and shewn how little it serves your Purpose, your Comment at the end of it must fall, as grounded upon your Mistake of the Matter in Dispute.

Your

Your Fourth *Objection* p. 36. is a very old one indeed, and answer'd over and over again, which ought to make you a little ashamed of repeating it again, without considering those long and distinct Answers that have been made to it, by Dr. Stillingfleet and Dr. Sherlock. If the *National Church*, say you, has any Authority, it must be a Political Society; If it is a Political Society, it must have a constitutive regent Head; If it have not, it has no Authority. This is the formidable Argument. Now if the Reader have a mind to see at full length, what has been answer'd to this, let him consult the *Vindication of the Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet*, from p. 178. to p. 226. Here it is sufficient to remark, that you would impose upon your Reader, when you make the old Answer to what has been said to this pretended Difficulty. Dr. Stillingfleet and Dr. Sherlock say, it is not necessary that this Church should have a *Constitutive Regent Head*, because the Catholick Church is a true Church, without any such Head. To which you return, That our Lord Jesus Christ is the Head of it; as if it were not a visible Head you were disputing about, as if a *National Church*, many particular Churches united and combin'd together, and their Governours advising, and making Resolutions together, had not this same Head. After which you insinuate, that the Dean denies Jesus Christ to be the Regent Head of the Church. Certainly he may deny him to be such a Head to the Catholick Church, as you are enquiring after for the National Church, without any Crime; and if you mean to require no other sort of Head to the *National Church*, than there is to the *Catholick*, there is no Dispute between you and him. You impose upon your Reader again, when you pretend to tell him, That the true Reason we say there is no necessity for such a Head, is because we are at a loss to tell who he is. For if you have any Skill in this part of the Controversie, you must know, that we consider the *National*

tional Church, as a Combination of several particular Churches of Christ, which have distinct Bishops of their own ; that we say these Bishops have Power to rule their own People according to God's Word ; that when these Bishops have with mutual Advice and Assistance prescrib'd Rules of Worship, the People in their several Dioceses are under an Obligation to obey 'em. It is an easy matter to puzzle a good Cause, but not so easy to deal fairly and ingenuously with a Cause we are resolv'd to oppose. You answer what you please to the Objections you make, and here you run on, about the *Parliament-Consent*, out of your own Head ; when you ought to know, if you don't, that tho' *King*, *Lords* and *Commons* had been Enemies to the Christian Faith, yet there might have been several Christian Churches in this Nation ; that these Churches would necessarily consist of some to Govern, and some to Obey ; some that had a useful Authority, and some whose Duty it was to submit to it ; and that this Authority could not be lessen'd, nor the Obligation to Obedience alter'd, if these Churches should be combin'd together, and their Governors meet, and consult, and decree, in agreement with one another. This you see is founded upon the institution of a Church Society, and the necessity of preserving Peace and Unity in it. And if you would but please to apprehend, that the *Church of England* may be consider'd as a part of the Universal Christian Church, made up of the several Episcopal Churches in this Land, as well as a Church establish'd by the Civil Power, (as you will own a *Presbyterian Church* may be consider'd as a Church of Christ, as well as a Church tolerated by the Laws of the Land) you would see how wide you are of your Point in this Chapter, and how ridiculous your Observation is, that an *Act of Parliament* is no *Divine Covenant*, nor *Baptismal Vow*, which alone can constitute a Church, according to the Dean.

But

But it is pretty to see with what an air you conclude this Chapter, p. 38. You assure your Reader positively, 1st, *That the King and Parliament are the Makers, as well as the Head of that Church of England you have separated from.* It would not be adviseable for any Church of Christ to have the Civil Power of its side, for then, it seems, the *Civil Power* is the Maker of this Church. This is as much as to say, you will not consider the Church of *England*, as we say you ought, and answer our Reasonings about the necessity of Obedience to that Authority that is in this Church, as we explain and maintain it ; but will make what you please of it, and oppose the Creature of your own Invention. But pray, Could there have been no *Church of England*, no such Combination of Churches, and agreement of their Bishops, if the King and Parliament had been Heathen, or unconcern'd Spectators? If there had been, who would have been the Makers of it? Would not there have been the least Authority in it? Nor the least Obligation of Obedience to the Christian People in this Nation? 2dly, You assure your Reader, *That the Toleration makes Conformists and Nonconformists one Church of England*; not in our Sense, you very well know. No Power upon Earth can dispense with your Obligation to preserve a Union in this Church, and live in obedience to the Authority of the Governors of it. In your own Sense it may, that is, If separate Churches are *one Church*, because they are in the same Land, and the Members of them under one *Civil Government*. And in that Sense you may call 'em *One*, if you please. But I desire to know, what you were before this Act of Toleration? And what this signifies to our Question? A little afier you express it otherwise, *Authority has made them a Church, the same Authority has given us a Permission to form our selves into Churches.* This is still a Device of your own. Civil Authority did not make us a Church, nor can it ever give

give you permission to separate from us (any more than it can dissolve the eternal Obligation to Peace and Union in the Church) in that Sense, that you may separate from us without Sin ; unless your Consciences will not permit you to remain in our Communion, and then you might separate without Sin, whether the Civil Power would protect you or no. Your Comment upon your own Words, is this ; *So that we stand on the same Ground, tho' not on the Level with them.* Are you then *above us*, or *below us*? One would think by your reasoning hereabouts, that you meant *above us*. And indeed I should prefer a Church only permitted by the Civil Power, before one establish'd by it ; if, as it seems, the latter is the *Creature of the State*, and made by it : This is our Unhappiness, but I don't find this affirmed of your own Churches. 3dly, You observe to your Reader the *Triumphant Estate, and large Revenues of the Conformists, but you neither Envy nor Murmur, &c.* Some of you have no need, and I believe, if Temporal Interest were only consulted, would not leave what you call the *Voluntary Contributions of your People*, to take your Chance in this *Church Triumphant* ; but what is this to the *Authority of the Church*? 4thly, You conclude with great Satisfaction, *That the Cry of the Church's Jurisdiction and Authority over You, and of Rebellion against Her, is quite turn'd out of Doors.* I suppose you mean the *Toleration* has done this, and your admirable Performance in this Chapter. But I think I have said what is sufficient to shew this signifies very little, unless you are resolv'd to consider the *Church of England*, as no Church of Christ, as nothing but a *Creature of the Civil Power*. And then you may talk as long as you please, for I know no Body that you oppose. In the mean while assure your self, that they who us'd to talk of it, still insist upon this *Church's Authority*, and still ac-

count your contempt of it very Unchristian and Unreasonable.

If the Subject of this Chapter had not been very material to our main Point, I should beg the Reader's Pardon, for having been so tedious. But, I hope you, as well as he, will forgive me, if I tell you once more in the Conclusion of this Chapter, what I have in effect said before; That if you would have disputed against the *Conformists*, you should have disputed against *their* Notions, and not *your own*; if you would have prov'd any thing against such an Authority as is pleaded for in the *Church of England*, you should have shewn, That there ought not to be any such Authority in the Christian Church, or any part of it; That our Blessed Lord did not design there should be; or, That the *Church of England* is not part of the Christian Church; or, That there are no Persons in it, who pretend to this Authority, or in whom it ought to be acknowledg'd to be; or, That they have abused this Authority, and order'd such Things as are contrary to the Rules or Nature of the Gospel. Something like this you should have attempted to have prov'd, and then I should not have had occasion to tell you, that this whole Chapter, and ev'ry part of it, is nothing to your purpose.

## C H A P. IV.

YOur fourth Chapter may, for ought I know, do you some Service ; but I confess I cannot see how it promotes your present Design, or answers it's own Title. If you mean by *kind Expressions*, such as speak favourably of the Guilt of those who separate from a Church, with which they can joyn without Sin, that is, those truly and properly call'd *Schismaticks*, such *Dissenters* as deserve that Name, you know you can produce no such Passages : And yet it is such one would expect from the Title of this Chapter. But if you mean *Expressions*, from which you can prove such *Schismaticks profess'd Christians*, I know no Body that denies it. But what signifies it, 1st, To shew that you are made *Members of the Universal Church*, by your *Covenant with God in Baptism*? And to stop there, as if this did not lay the greatest Obligation upon you to consult and preserve the Unity and Harmony of that Church? As if this could be done by separating from that part of it you find settled in your Native Country, when you can *Communicate with it without Sin*? As if you did not know, that some after-Actions may forfeit our Title to the Blessings of the Baptismal Covenant ? And, as if an *Unnecessary Separation* from a sound Church, may not be one of those Actions, for all any thing that has been shewn to the contrary ? I grant you will not say yours is *Unnecessary*; but you know they that account it so great a Sin, not only think it so, but have advanced somewhat that looks like proving it so. What signifies it 2dly, To observe from the Dean, that all *Acts of Communion*, are *Acts of Communion with the Universal Church* ; and thence to infer, That *He* must allow *Yours* to be so, and therefore *You* to be in *Communion with the Universal Church*?

When you know his Inference is quite otherwise, and that he thinks he has prov'd that *this Catholick Communion* is not to be maintain'd, but by *Communion* with that particular part of the *Catholick Church* settled by Providence where you are Born, if that can honestly be enjoy'd; but that *Separation* from *this*, and *Communion* with *that*, are inconsistent. It would have been proper to have reserved this to the last part of your Work, after you had shewn the weakness of those Arguments he proposes to prove this. What signifies it, 3dly, To produce his Words, that *that is a sound and orthodox part of the Christian Church, which has nothing sinful in it's Communion*, as favourable to you? When you must know this was said to shew the necessity of your living in *Communion* with the *Church of England*, as a sound Church; and that both this, and the definition of a Church you produce out of the Articles (if you acknowledge it to be a good one at any time, but when it makes to your Purpose) do help to aggravate your Guilt in separating from the *Church of England*. This is almost as little to your Purpose, as your kind Reflexion upon the *Sincerity of some Conformists, in subscribing the Articles*, which shews a *bad Spirit*, and is apt to make Men suspect a *bad Cause*. But you not only shew these Expressions of the Dean's to be in effect very *favourable* to your Cause (which he little thought indeed when he argued from 'em against your *Separation*); but hence you prove the *Dean and those Conformists Schismatics from the Catholick Church, who refuse Communion with you*. This is hard indeed. *That Church*, says the Dean, *is sound, which has nothing sinful in it's Communion; therefore you ought to live in the Communion of the Church of England, if that is such a Church*. Now, do you think that they who argue thus, can think it no Sin, to joyn in *Communion* with you, who they think Sin in separating from this Church? *Communion* with you implies a Sin, in their Opinion;

And

And how then can you argue, from themselves, that they ought to Communicate with you? If they had found your Churches settled indeed, and had begun or continued a Separation from them, you might with some Face, and would I believe have argued from this Principle, but as you apply it now, it is made good for nothing.

---

## C H A P. V.

**Y**Our fifth Chapter undertakes to examine the Rules the Dean lays down in order to the judging which are *Schismatical Churches*. The First is this; *There must be but one Church in one Place, &c.* Case. p. 20. where the Reader may find this Rule explain'd plainly to this Purpose, That where there is a Church of Christ settled, and already constituted, and also distinct and separate Churches form'd out of this, here is a Schism; and either the one side, or the other, either the Church already settled there, or the separate Church form'd afterwards, must lye under the Guilt of that Sin. Why this should be call'd a *strange and Schismatical Rule*, I do not see. But you endeavour to prove it so; 1st, *Because a Church may impose sinful Terms of Communion, and then the Church form'd within the Bowels of this, is not to be blam'd, but the Church that imposes such Terms.* Who denies this? All that the Rule says is, That when this Case happens, here is a *Schism*. But will any Man say, as you go on, *That Church is cut off from the Catholick Church, &c.* This is wholly another Question, which you have reserved for another Chapter; the Case before us now is, Whether this is a good Rule, and gives us any Light in the Business of Schismatical Churches. But you need not doubt but that

that if it is the Dean's Position that *Schismaticks are cut off from the Catholick Church*, He is not so in Love with Papists, as to except them. In what Sense he maintains that, I shall examine by and by. In the mean time here is no Dispute between You and Him ; and I hope you will give me leave to say, That those Christians, who do either impose sinful Terms of Communion, or who make separation from a Christian Church, that does not impose such Terms, are guilty of a very great Sin. But, 2dly, *This Rule, you say, deals as hardly with the Episcopal Men in Scotland, who you say have their separate Meetings in Houses, and so endeavour to form Churches within other Churches.* I answer, All this Rule can do, is to teach us, that if there is a Church form'd there within the Bowels of another settled there before, there is a Schism ; on which Side the Guilt lies, it was not the design of it to inform us. But I must observe to you, That if these *Episcopal Clergy* are really convinc'd, after their best Inquiries, that *Episcopacy* is not only of Divine Institution, but also *Essential* to the being of a *Church* (some such you know there are) neither this Rule, nor any thing else, can prove them Guilty of *Schism*, or a *sinful Separation*. Nay, if they are not, you know how to help them off, tho' the Dean should not, by what you say in your last Chapter, viz. *The People cannot forsake their ejected Bishops and their Successours, nor they their People without Sin.* All that this Rule proves, is, That supposing you have stated this Case right, there is a Schism in *Scotland*. So, what you say, 3dly, Of the *Lutherans and Calvinists in Germany, and the Arminians in Holland*, appears to me to come to as little. For if this is to your purpose, here must be Separations made from one Church settled, not only two Churches of Christians in the same Place, but one form'd within the Bowels of another, and the Communion of one distinct from the Communion of the other, and then all that the Rule says

says is, that either on one side or the other there is the Guilt of Schism. As for your 4th Objection, You should have proved the Truth of that Opinion, That the *Jews* and *Gentiles* had Two distinct Communions and Churches, and Bishops, at *Rome*, or *Antioch*, and accounted for all the Difficulties that attend it, before you had objected it to one who has profess'd he does not believe it [See *Vindic.* of Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 441.] and then also have shewn that it fully comes up to the Point now before us. As to your 5th, It is only altering the Scene, and what I have said to your second Objection taken from *Scotland*, may be applied here. To what you say of *Holland* under this Head, I reply, That the Churches of *Englishmen* there, are to be consider'd with relation to the Church settled here, that they lose not that relation they have to their Bishops, nor the Obligation they are under to obey their Prescriptions about the Worship of God, tho' they go out of the Land. That as we account 'em Guilty of Schism, if they set up, or encourage separate Churches in their own Country, so if their Bishops think fit to appoint a Priest (under their Inspections) to Minister to 'em in Holy Things, while they are in another Country, we think they ought to comply with this appointment. And tho' they are not to blame for not doing it, when they have not an opportunity, yet they are as Guilty when they act upon Principles of Separation in *Holland*, as when they dissent in *England*: And none but those whom we think chargeable with Schism at Home, will joyn with Ministers sent over by our *Dissenters*, rather than with those authoriz'd by their *Bishops*. But I do not apprehend the Case of *Foreigners*, in a strange Land, to affect this Rule at all. The Dean does not blame those *Travellers* who conform to the sound Churches settled in the Lands they go into, nor is he obliged by this Rule to call those Schismaticks, who when they remain in another Country for some time,

live under the Ministry of a Pastor appointed and plac'd amongst them by the Governors of that Church to which they originally belong as Natives of their own Country. For *Foreigners* who do thus, can't be said to separate from, or to refuse Communion with, the Church settled in the Land where they thus live. Thus the Foreigners in *England*, are not Churches gathered out of a Church already settled, and form'd within the Bowels of it, but are really Churches already constituted in other Lands, and only living here after the Model of that Church they originally belong'd to. Here is a vast difference between these, and such Churches as are form'd of those People whose Obedience the Governors of the *Establish'd Church* claim, form'd in opposition to the *Establish'd Church*, gather'd out of it, and of fatal consequence to the Peace and quiet of it: Which may serve to give some Account of that *unkind difference* we make between them, which you complain of (p. 63.) for who that considers the difference between such *Churches of Foreigners*, and the *Dissenting Churches* does not see a very good Reason for it? But you have several Remarks upon the Account the Dean gives of these Foreigners in *England* (p. 57.) For 1st, *He knows not whether it is Church or State that has allowed this liberty to Foreigners*. I Answer, It was not to his purpose to enquire or determine this; all that he means is, That the *Church of England* does not account 'em Schismatics, for living in this Land, according to their original Model. But I wonder, for all this, that you should not think it somewhat better for all Foreigners to conform to the Model of the Church settled where they reside, if they can without Sin; and that you should reflect upon *Archbishop Laud* for endeavouring to bring about such a *Conformity* in those *Foreigners*, who have settled their Habitations among us. Yet this it seems is *bringing 'em under the Yoke*, and from hence occasion is taken of telling a

Story

Story out of a Writer of your own, as if this was an Argument why the King of *France* should persecute those Protestants who could not conform to his Religion without Sin, and as if the Cases were at all parallel. 2. *The Dean is mistaken in his Notion about the Foreigners in this Country.* It imports little if He is. They live according to the Model and Prescriptions of the Church, they originally belong'd to, and they own the Communion of the Church of *England*, they are not separate upon any Principle of Separation, but they were form'd Churches before they settled here. And this is all the Dean intends in his Observation about 'em, which you oppose with Suppositions not at all to your purpose. But 3. you argue out of the Dean, *That the Church of England is obliged to think these Schismaticks.* For they, and the Church of *England* are Churches not Members of each other. But, you know he says, *They are Members of each other,* and tho' they are *different* yet they are not *separate Churches*, and (at least, as he thinks) they have not such an Opinion of the Church of *England*, and the Terms of Communion in it, as to justify such a Separation from it, as those Churches have made which are form'd out of it. These are two very different Things, *Churches already constituted, transplanted over into this Land, and still continuing what they were : And Churches form'd of such Persons as are born where there is a Church already constituted, whose Obedience is due to the Governors of this Church they were born in.* The Members of the one have not separated from that Church, nor withdrawn their Obedience from those Governors of it that claim their Submission upon Terms they can comply with without Sinning: The Members of the other, I mean, a vast number of 'em, have: And so their Cases are not at all alike.

Now we come to his 2d Rule, which is this, *Those are separate Churches which divide from the Communion of any Church from any dislike of its Doctrin, Government, or Worship.* If our Author, say you, mean by *separate Schismatical Churches* (as he must if he speaks to his purpose) what you have said against

his first Rule, overthrows this as effectually as it did that. That it may do ; but if I have shew'd that it does not overthrow that, neither will it overthrow this. But I must tell you, that by *separate Churches*, the Dean does not mean *Schismatical Churches*, nor is it the design of this Rule to brand all *Churches* that have *separated* from others upon these Accounts with that Name ; but to observe, that where there are *distinct Communions* set up for these Reasons, there is certainly a Separation, and Division made ; on which side to fix the guilt of it, other Considerations will determine. He knows as well as you that there may be such a Separation made, and yet the guilt of Schism ly, not upon that part of *Christians* that have separated, but upon that part that has forc'd 'em to separate. So what you have said here is not against this Rule.

And now, having examin'd these two Rules, you endeavour to prove, *That they are nothing to the purpose, and of no use, in order to find out Schismatical Churches.* But that they do tend to this I think is plain ; that is, as far as they were design'd. For supposing the truth of the first Rule (as you do here) where I find many *Churches* in one place, not meerly *different Churches*, but some of them within the Bowels of another, gather'd and form'd out of it ; this Rule serves to inform me, that here is a Separation, and that upon one or more of these *Churches* the guilt of *Schism* lies. But on which of these it is, as you observe, it does not say, nor was it design'd to say, but still it directs me where it is I may be sure there is a *Schism* : and so alarms me, and makes me consider the state of these *Churches*, and the Principles on which these *separate Churches* are founded, in order to find out which is *Schismatical*, and to avoid it. The Case you put of your *Traveller* is not parallel to this. For we do not make it so indifferent a matter as you here do, which Road the *Christian-Traveller* takes ; we say, it is his Duty to take one particular Path of those many, which look as if they would carry him to the same place. And because we think there

there is one most secure, in order to alarm him, and make him consider, we give him notice of this. And then after this also your *parallel* fails. For tho' in *separate and distinct Paths* there are not certain Marks to direct the Traveller which He ought not to take, which is dangerous ; yet in *separate and distinct Churches*, there are certain Marks to direct a Christian of a moderate Understanding on which the guilt of the Separation lies : which is quite another Consideration. And tho' it would be to little purpose to tell your Traveller that there is but one of all these ways safe and secure, because there are no certain visible Marks upon those that are dangerous, yet it is of some advantage to a Christian to warn him, that of *distinct and separate Churches* in the same place there is one which it very much concerns him not to forsake ; because there are obvious and plain Characters both upon that one Church he ought to join with, and upon those *Schismatical Churches* he ought to avoid ; and this Warning leads him to such Considerations as are useful to him upon this occasion. So that this Rule is to some purpose, tho' it reaches no farther than was design'd. As for that assurance you give ev'ry honest and sincere Christian upon this occasion, that if he truly endeavours to inform his Conscience, and lives according to it, he shall never be miserable, I know not to what it tends. It makes neither for *You*, nor against the *Dean*, who, I dare say, is not one of those *Ecclesiastical Bigots* you would here make your Reader believe he is, nor ever gave you occasion by any of his Writings to think so. The same Answer may serve for your *Civil* against the usefulness of his second Rule, which was design'd to inform a Christian when it is that he may be sure there is a *Schism*, not on which side the guilt of it lies. Where-ever there is a Separation from a Church, upon the account mention'd in this Rule, there he may be sure there is a Schism ; but on which side the guilt of it lies, other Considerations, not design'd to be insisted on here, are to direct him.

The same Mistake runs through your Examination of the third Rule, which was design'd only to let us know, that where we find more than one Church, and these Churches not owning each others Members as their own, as Persons in Communion with them ; here we may be sure there is a Schism, but on which side the guilt lies, it was not design'd to determine. That every such Church that does not own the Members of another is Schismatical it is far from saying ; therefore your bringing in the Church of *England's Excommunication of Schismatics, &c.* is by mistake, and cannot prove what it is alledg'd for. How far it serves your Cause, we shall have occasion to examine when we come to your last Chapter.

---

## C H A P. VI.

**Y**Our Sixth Chapter examines the Dean's Notion of *Fixt and Occasional Communion*. You are pretty well agreed, I think, in what you Dissenters call *Fixt*, and what you call *Occasional Communion* ; only you are very angry with the Dean for mentioning a *Secular end*, when he reckons up the Reasons of your *Occasional Communion* with a *Church*, with which you refuse *constant Communion* : And hence you are led to give us the true Reasons of your Communicating with us as *Occasion* serves, among which there are two, which I think, are *secular ends* ; *A generous desire* (as you term it) of *doing Service to our Country* ; that is, in other Words, to qualify us for an Office, which sometimes happens to be a *profitable one* ; and *to save our selves from Ruine* ; which must be when there is no *Toleraion*, and therefore is none of your present Reasons. Both these, I say, I take to be *secular Ends*, and neither better nor worse than what the Dean meant. Yet here you fly out with a great deal of Passion,

sion, and call in question the *Honesty of One*, who has given the World sufficient evidence in the most dangerous times, (when some others thought fit to be silent) that it is not in the Power of Temporal Considerations to alter his Principles. If the Dean had had as *favourable an Opinion* of taking the Oaths, as you seem here to have of Communicating with the Church of *England* now and then, he would have done that at first for the Union of the State, which you think fit to insinuate he did afterwards for his own private advantage: Whereas you refuse to do that constantly, for the Peace and Quiet of the Christian Church, which you declare you think lawful to do sometimes *for apparent temporal Ends*. So that if you were resolved to recriminate, the Cases are not parallel, and your Insinuation grossly uncharitable. But to proceed, the next Thing you attempt is to fasten an absurdity upon the Dean's words, as if it follow'd from his Notions that *there is no such thing as Communion at all*. *Fixt Communion* is the only true Notion of Communion. *Occasional Communion* (that is, what the Dissenters call so, their Communion with the Church of *England*) does not deserve that Name, it being Communion with a Church of which they are not Members. Very well. But the Dean, it seems, says that *Fixt Communion in the Parochial Church where I usually live, and Occasional Communion in that where I am accidentally present*, are of the same Nature. Whence it unavoidably follows that *Fixt Communion* does not deserve that Name, and that there is no such thing as Communion at all. This is your reasoning, as if you should argue thus, *Occasional Communion* (in the Dissenters Sense) Communion with a Church whereof we are not Members, is not properly Communion. Therefore *Occasional Communion* (as we may use that Word in another Sense) Communion with a Church whereof we are Members, is not properly Communion. All that the Dean says, is, That Communion with that Parish-Church where we live *may be call'd fix'd Communion*, and Communion with another Parish-Church may be call'd *Occasional*; not that this Occasional Communion

on is of the same nature with that the Dissenters call so : Which he does not allow, as you say, but absolutely deny ; for he affirms the one to be *Communion* with Churches, which are Members one of another, the other to be *Communion* with *separate* Churches. Now it is not good reasoning, to apply what he says of Occasional Communion in one Sense, to what he says of it in another. *Fix'd Communion* and *Occasional Communion* in one Sense, *may be of the same Nature*, as he says, but it is a little hard to infer from hence, that *Fix'd Communion*, and what is call'd *Occasional* in another Sense, are of the same Nature. So that he has not *unawares destroy'd fix'd Communion*, whatever you think, except you can prove it good *Logick*, to argue from the Truth of a Proposition in one Sense, to the Truth of it in another.

What follows (p. 74.) might have been as well spared, and would have been, if you had consider'd that the Dean plainly says, that a Person by being made a Member of any sound particular Church, is made a Member of the Universal Church, and has a right by this means to all the Privileges of a Member, and that as he ought to Communicate in whatever part of the World he is, with the Churches settled in the Lands he is in, provided he can without Sin ; so those Churches ought to admit him to Acts of Communion with them, and acknowledge him a Member of their own Church, as he is a Member of a sound part of the Universal Church. For he is truly a Member of them, as they are sound Christian Churches, nay he is made so by being made a Member of his own particular Church, for by that means it is that he is made a Member of the whole Church.

Having thus shewn, that what you have advanced in this Chapter, carries little demonstration along with it ; your Conclusion signifies little, and the Dean may have prov'd, what he thinks he has, for all what you have produc'd against him. It may be yet a Contradiction to talk of an *Occasional Act of Communion*, for you have not yet shewn, either when it is understood in your Sense (as *Communicating* with a *Church*,

*Church, of which we are not Members) that it is properly an Act of Communion, or that all Acts of Communion with a Church whereof we are Members, both stated and occasional, are not of the same nature, i. e. Acts of Communion with the whole Church of Christ. Such, Acts of Communion with any sound Church may be said to be, till the contrary is shewn, and so they are equally fix'd, and equally occasional with the whole Church.* That is, they cannot be *occasional* or *fix'd* with one part and not with another, because they are as much Acts of Communion with every part, as with one part, and all, as well what the Dean says may be call'd Occasional, as what may be call'd *Fix'd*, (not what you call so) of the same Nature. That is, All Acts of Communion are to be look'd on as Acts of Communion with the whole Church, and therefore of the same Nature; tho' you have found out some differences in them, which do not in the least affect their Nature, consider'd as Acts of Christian Communion, and as such they ought to be consider'd. And this being so, all *Acts of Communion* (properly so call'd) with a particular Church, are Acts of *Fix'd Communion*; not with *that particular Church* (as distinct from all others) as you explain it, but (which is to the Dean's purpose, whether you think so or no) with the *whole Christian Church*, to which the Christian has a *fix'd* and permanent Relation; and this without the absurdity you imagine in it, as you interpret it.

## C H A P. VII.

**Y**Our seventh Chapter is directed against this Proposition of the Dean's, *That where what you call Occasional Communion is Lawful, there constant Communion is a Duty*; That is, That where there is a settled Church of Christ, with which you can upon *some Occasions* exercise all Acts of Christian Communion, you ought to exercise these *constantly* with it, not begin or encourage separate Communions, or endeavour to form Churches within the Bowels of this Church. And this we say, because we believe there is such a thing as a wicked Separation, and we know of no other Rule to put a stop to eternal Schisms in the Church. Two, not only *different*, but *distinct* and *separate Churches*, one form'd within the Bowels of another, cannot be in the same Place without a Schism, and the guilt of it on one side or other. Now, where we find the Case thus, we ought not to communicate with that Church, which is the Guilty, and the Schismatical, which ever it is. But if we find that Church, from which the Separation is made, to be free from this Guilt, to impose nothing but what we can joyn in, this we ought constantly to joyn with, as the Church settled where the Providence of God has caus'd us to be Born, as the Church from which it is unreasonable to separate. This is the Argument, and I know not any thing you have said yet, which shews it to be weak. Different Churches may be possibly in the same Nation without Sin, and if they are so, an *English Traveller* may communicate with any of them, as he sees fit, and as his Conscience will permit him. But to say this Rule obliges him to *Impossibilities* is to say any thing, without any design of speaking to the purpose.

You proceed to examine another Reasoning of the *Dean's* upon this Subject, (p. 79.) which I shall fairly represent, and leave the Reader to judge, whether it ought to have excited

cited your Mirth so much as it seems to have done. *When Men communicate occasionally, as they speak (observe those Words) with all the different Parties of Christians in a divided Church, they either communicate* (that is, according to the true and proper signification of the Word) *with none, or with all.* After this, he proves what he says, and the Inconveniences and Absurdities attending both these. If they mean by communicating, performing these *Acts of Communion*, not as Members of these Churches, then they communicate truly, and properly speaking, according to the Notion he had before advanced of Communion) with none, which is a sinful Omission. If they mean, by Communicating, performing those *Acts in them all as Members*, then they are in Communion (not with different parts of Christ's Church, which have not separated from one another, but) with distinct and separate parts in the same Country, some of which must be Schismatical. This is the Proposition, and this is the proof of it, and of the Inconvenience following, granting which of the two you please: And whether there is such ridiculous weakness in it, you are not to determine, but to leave to others to judge. You have not yet prov'd that what you call *Occasional Communion* is properly so call'd, and therefore you have not destroy'd the ground of the Argument. The Supposition you presently make does not come up to our Point. There may be different Churches in the same Country without a Schism: And till you show that some of these Churches were form'd out of another already constituted, you will not be able to show, that the same Reasoning concludes him a Schismatick, who (as he is a Member of the Universal Church, is a Member of ev'ry sound part of it, and therefore) communicates with these different Churches. His Communion is not *Occasional* in your Sense, nor is the *Dean* oblig'd, by the Principles you are now examining, to think any more amiss of him, than you do.

What follows next is an attempt to shew the usefulness of such a Separation as we complain of, with respect both to Church and State. This ought to be your Design, if you would

would say any thing relating to the Subject we are upon. And yet at last it is all resolved into this, *That where Men are all of a Mind, Learning and Religion* (and the State too, I suppose from what follows) *dwindle away*, and are in Danger. But Men may be of different Opinions in many Things, and yet not divide and *separate* from the *Communion of a Church*, not gather Churches out of it, not throw off all Obedience to the Prescriptions of lawful Authority. These are two Things very distant from one another. And tho' you could prove that such a Separation carried some advantage along with it, yet you can never shew this is enough to compensate those Heats and Passions it necessarily causes, and which we see it has rais'd; nor to prove it lawful. *Being of one Mind*, at least so far as not to invade and disturb the Peace of Church and State, is what is recommended to us in the Gospel; and tho' Schisms *must be*, and you may find out some accidental good use for them, yet *Wo be to that Man by whom they come*. What if *some may Preach twice a Day to keep their People* (who do not always think reasonably, and may be led to judge that the best Church which has most Preaching and most Noise in it) *from running to Conventicles*, as you say? You must be sensible, the same may be said of the good use of any Diversion on *Sunday* in the Afternoon, which is not therefore Lawful. And, what if *the Conformists may thank the Dissenters for the goodness of the Sermons they have*, as well as the frequency (which indeed is a new Discovery; the Language, Method, Argument, and Subjects commonly handled, being sufficient to shew no relation or affinity between the Discourses of the one, and those of the other) yet this will prove nothing but that *the Dissenters are better Preachers*, not that they are not guilty of a Sin, in making use of that Talent they are so great Masters of, to draw away our People from us; not that they are so useful to the Church, as they would be, if they had not broke the Peace of it, but made use of this Talent only in their private Conversation, *to persuade Men to Unity and Concord*. But still you go on,

on, and bring in the Philosopher *Themistius* to shew the usefulness of *Disagreeing Opinions*: When it is not *disagreeing Opinions* we are complaining of, but a *Separation of Communions*, a division from a Church, a breach of the Peace and Concord of Christians, an unnecessary departure from what you ought to comply with, a transgression of the Laws of that Love and Unity, which are the *Perfection* of the *Christian Church*, whatever advantage *different Opinions* may be to *Philosophy and Arts*.

You have but one thing more to urge upon this Head, and that is the *Example of St. Paul*, which indeed is a considerable Argument, if you had taken any pains to show that it was home to the purpose of *Occasional Communion*: But as you have left it to shift for it self, I do not see what it proves, unless it be this, *That to hinder the beginning or progress of a great and apparent disadvantage to the Christian Religion, a Christian ought to comply with a Church establish'd, if he can do it without Sin, tho' there are such Things in the Constitution and Worship of it, as he thinks had better be alter'd*. This, I think, it certainly proves; and which Side this affects, let any one judge. But to bring it to your purpose, and to show St. *Paul* an Occasional Communicant in your Sense, you must show several Things, which are not yet apparent. For Example, you must prove, That St. *Paul* had made or encourag'd a Separation of one or more Jewish Churches from this already settled: That he did not own himself a Member of this, that he did not constantly communicate with it, when he was at *Jerusalem*; or that he constantly communicated with another Jewish Church, form'd out of this, and set up in opposition to it by Men, upon dislike of the Government, or Doctrine, or Worship of this Church. These, and several other Things you should have prov'd, to have made St. *Paul's* Practice an encouragement to your *Occasional Communion*. In the mean while, I shall in brief represent the Injustice of this parallel. The two Churches you speak of, were the Jewish Church (properly so call'd) instituted by

God himself, and appointed to remain till he should think fit to abolish it, and the Christian Church, now just instituted by God also, made up of those who believed in Jesus. In England the several Churches we are speaking of are, *The Episcopal Christian Church* settled in the Land, and other *Christian Churches* that have separated themselves from this Church, not by God's express appointment, but as they themselves thought fit. St. Paul was a Member of this Jewish Church, and never set up another Jewish Church upon any dislike of it. He endeavour'd indeed to convert Jews to the Christian Faith, he taught 'em as they believ'd in God, to believe also in Jesus Christ ; but this, not drawing them from the Communion of the Church settled, as long as it was consistent with their being, and professing themselves Christians. This they might enjoy, and be present at all Acts of Jewish Worship as constantly as any Jews, and yet be Christians, yet meet together for the performance of Acts of Communion peculiar to the Christian Religion, as they were expressly commanded by their Lord. But you have separated (as you your selves thought fit) from a settled Christian Church, and set up other Christian Churches upon your own dislike of this already constituted. You have drawn Christians from a Christian Church establish'd. Again, St. Paul, if I am not mistaken, did ordinarily and constantly communicate with the Jewish Church, whenever he could, and in the place you quote is said to perform some Ceremonies in the Temple enjoyn'd by the Law, because he would not hinder the propagation of the Gospel, but was willing to remove that Prejudice from the Jews, that Christianity was an Enemy to their Religion, and that he preach'd against the Jews still observing the Law of Moses ; which is no secular end, but was absolutely necessary at that time for the Interest of Christianity in that Country. You refuse the ordinary and constant exercise of Communion with us, tho' nothing could do the Christian Cause a greater piece of Service; and now and then you join with us in Acts of Communion,

not

not for any advantage to the *Christian Religion*, but sometimes (as you must acknowledge) for Ends wholly secular. Here is a wide difference between the two Cases. And indeed, if you would have the Example of an *Apostle* to plead, you ought to produce one, who, when a *Christian Church* was already settled in a place, with which he thought it lawful at any time to communicate, either begun or encourag'd a Separation from this; or show, that he join'd with those, who refus'd to obey the Prescriptions of the Governors of this Church, that he communicated ordinarily with *these*, and now and then, upon a temporal Consideration, communicated with *that Church* settled before. This will come up to our Point, if I rightly understand the Case we are now upon. But, as yet, I must think St. *Paul's* Example far from a just parallel.

---

## C H A P. VIII.

**Y**OUR Eighth Chapter is design'd to show that *Schismatics* are *Christians*, and within the bounds of the *Church*. This you show from Mr. *Hooker*, from *Archbishop Bramhall*, from Dr. *Clagett*, and from Dr. *Sherlock* himself. This is exactly what was objected to the *Dean*, many years ago: And yet no notice is taken of the Answer he then gave to it, but the same Thing urg'd, as if it had never been heard of before. The *Dean's* Answer to this, you might have found in his *Vindication of the Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet*, p. 60. this being premis'd, p. 31. That the Authority of these late *Writers of the Church of England* (supposing they contradict him) is neither a sufficient Answer to him, nor a sufficient Justification of his Adversary and his Party, who are condemned by these very Men, whose Authority they oppose to him, tho' they do not value it themselves. But p. 60. &c. you find him.

him reconciling this appearing difference. He says expressly, *This difference is not real but verbal.* Mr. Hooker and Dr. Field believe Schismaticks as much out of the Church as I do, and I believe them to be as much in the Church as they do. The same may be said of the others you alledge. When Mr. Hooker asserts, *That all that profess the Faith of Christ, &c. are Members of the visible Church,* he understands the visible Church in a large Notion, to comprehend the whole Body of profess'd Christians. That they are Christians, you find here, he also acknowledges, and that they belong to the Church; but this he denies, when he takes the Church in a more confined Sense. He owns, *That they are visible Churches, as bad Men are visible Christians, but not such Churches as Christ will own,* p. 71. And any thing contrary to this you have not shown to be meant by any of the Authors you have produced: Now the Reason of this Assertion of his, which you are so angry at (tho' if it was his Opinion, I can't fee why you should be angry with him for letting you know it) is, because the Church is one Society or Communion; and the way of keeping in this one Communion, is being in Communion with that part of it, in which the Providence of God has plac'd you: Which therefore if you forsake, when you can continue in it without Sin, you are guilty of an Unchristian Schism. This is a serious Matter, and therefore (instead of taking notice of your prophanie Jest upon so sacred a Subject as the Trinity, or the allowance of *Three Emperors* which you produce for calling your selves Christians, which are very foreign to the Matter in hand) I shall rather, as a more proper conclusion of this Chapter, recommend this to the sober Consideration of all who are concern'd. That a Separation from a settled Church is not a light thing; That all who are engag'd in it, ought seriously to consider, whether this Separation is necessary, whether they have endeavour'd to inform themselves of the true state of the Case; and after thier best Enquiries are fully persuaded they should sin, if they should conform; (which is the only thing can render them excusable before God)

God) or whether they can answer for such a Separation from a Church with which they may hold Communion without sinning. That the Church of *England* is such a Church, the next Chapter, I hope, will afford us some proof.

---

## C H A P. IX.

**I** Come now to examine what you think a sufficient Justification of *Dissenters*, from the charge of *Schism*. All that I shall premise is this, That *an unreasonable and unnecessary Separation from a settled Church*, is the *Schism* we are disputing about: And I think in this we are agreed: for the method you take to justify *Dissenters* from the Charge of *Schism*, is by endeavouring to prove their *Separation necessary*. So that we are not Discoursing now about the Scripture-notion of the Word *Schism*, or the *Ingredients of Schism*; but this is our only Point, whether such a *Separation* from the *Church of England* as we complain of, is *Necessary*, or *Reasonable*. But before you come to this Point, You offer an Argument fram'd according to the Dean's Principles, to prove that *You are not Schismaticks from the Church of England*. *Schismaticks from the Church of England are Schismaticks from the Catholick church*. This is the Dean's Assertion. But, you say, you have prov'd in the foregoing Chapter, That *you are not Schismaticks from the Catholick church*; Therefore, the Dean must acknowledge, *you are not Schismaticks from the Church of England*, according to his own Reasoning. I answer, No such thing. If the Dean thinks you *Schismaticks from the Catholick Church*, he first thought you *Schismaticks from the Church of England*, and from thence infer'd it. Now, supposing he does not think you have prov'd, what you say you have in the foregoing Chapter, he is not obliged to think otherwise

wise than he did before. And supposing he is persuaded by your Arguments, that you are not *Schismaticks from the Catholick Church*, yet he is not oblig'd upon that account not to think you *Schismaticks from the Church of England*: But all that he is oblig'd to, by any Laws of Logick I know of, is to think that *Schismaticks from the Church of England are not Schismaticks from the Catholick Church*, which is a quite different thing. But, besides this, you mistake your self, when you say you have prov'd in the foregoing Chapter, that *you are not Schismaticks from the Catholick Church*, unless you have prov'd somewhat, which it was not the design of that Chapter to prove. What that was you tell us in plain Words at the beginning of it, *viz.* That *supposing you are Schismaticks from the Church of England, yet you are not so from the Catholick Church*; so that the whole Chapter runs upon this Supposition, That you are *Schismaticks from our Church*: and all the Authorities you produce are design'd to show that *Schismaticks from a particular Church, still belong to the Catholick Church*. Now supposing the Dean should grant, for *Disputation-sake* (as you speak) that you have prov'd this, in the Sense that he denied it; yet he may still hold, that *Schismaticks from the Church of England, are Schismaticks from the Church of England*. Thus it appears, that you did not design to prove in the foregoing Chapter, what you say you have; that if you have prov'd it, yet the Dean is not oblig'd to alter his Opinion, till he himself thinks so; and that if he himself should really think you have, yet he is not oblig'd to grant your Consequence, but may still think you *Schismaticks from the Church of England*. But, to proceed,

Your Second Argument, in order to vindicate your People from the guilt of an *Unreasonable Separation*, is taken from the *unreasonable and strange Terms required of your Ministers, for non-compliancy wherewith several were ejected many years ago, and others are still kept out: and the Obligation the People are under to join with these Dissenting Ministers*. And indeed, if you could prove this, we must give up the Cause. For the Reader's Satisfaction in this Point, I will

Firſt,

*First*, Examine what you alledge for the proof of this.

*Secondly*, I will state your Argument, and show it him in its full Strength ; from whence I shall observe to him several Things that remain yet to be prov'd before it can do you any Service. And

*Thirdly*, I will show that if the Principles you reason upon are true, they make very much against *your selves*.

The first Point concerns the *unreasonable Terms required of Ministers in the Church of England, by the Act of Uniformity, which kept out your Predecessors, and still keep out you*. These I shall consider in the order you have thought fit to lay 'em down in, and say somewhat to ev'ry one of them, that so the Reader may judge, whether they are so *unreasonable Terms*, as you pretend. 1. *They must own Bishops as an Order (by Divine Right) superior to Presbyters.* It is more than I know, that any *Declaration or Subscription* to this purpose is required of *Ministers* in the *Church of England* : Nor can I think where to find any ground for this Charge, unless it be, that they are required to give their *Affsent and Consent* not only to the Book of *Common-Prayer*, but to the Form of *Consecration of Bishops, &c.* and to subscribe to this, *That this Form containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that it may lawfully be used, &c.* in the *Preface* to which Form the *Divine Right of Bishops* is asserted. If this is the ground of your Charge in this first Article, you should have done two Things, absolutely necessary, before this part of your Accusation can be made good: *First*, You should have prov'd that *Affsent and Consent* imply a perfect agreement to ev'ry particular Sentence in those *Forms*, and in the *Rubrics* and *Prefaces* belonging to them: which is a difficulty you may be fond of, as it is the most popular Excuse you have for your *Non-conformity*, but can hardly be grounded upon that *Act of Uniformity*, in which it is said, *That you are to declare your Affsent and Consent (not to the truth of ev'ry Proposition contain'd in those Forms, and the Prefaces to them: And certainly somewhat like this would have been said, if*

this had been intended by those who required this Declaration ; but to the use of all Things in the said Forms contain'd and prescrib'd, in these Words. Then follow the Words to be us'd, and it appears, they were intended for nothing but to declare your Agreement to the use of these Forms : And if you will stretch this Declaration farther than it was design'd to reach, and from thence form an Argument for Non-conformity ; you may complain, if you please, of hard Terms ; but you must give others leave to judge, that this is imposing hard Terms upon your selves, which therefore you ought not to complain of. For who is to be blam'd for this ? Others, who declare over and over again no such thing was intended ? or, your selves, who are resolv'd to interpret Words that are capable of, and determin'd to, another Signification, in the most rigorous Sense possible, and then cry out ? But then, in the next Place, if this had been express'd in the *Act*, as you seem to wish it had, yet you should have shown another thing to make good your Charge, and that is, That there is any such Position in that Form mention'd, or the Preface to it, as this, *Bishops are, of Divine Right, superiour to Presbyters,* I confess I see no such thing there, nor any thing more, than that *Bishops have been an Order in the Church ever since the Apostle's Days.* Not but that I think it may be, and hath been abundantly made out, that *Episcopacy*, or the Superiority of One over many *Presbyters*, was of Apostolical Institution , which is *Divine Institution*: And till I see Chillingworth's short Argument upon this Head, and what is produc'd out of the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus* fairly answer'd, and *Ignatius's Epistles* prov'd spurious, I shall think it too soon to urge this against any Church, as a Hardship upon her *Ministers*, supposing she required of them an assent to this ; much more, when the Church only declares in the Preface to the *Ordination-Form*, &c. as a reason for retaining such degrees of *Ministers* in the Church, that they have been in it ever since the Apostle's Days. You think fit to cavil at this, and put Scruples in People's Heads, but you advance nothing

nothing of an Argument against it. But, 2dly, By these Bishops, they must be Re-ordin'd, and this is to throw Dirt upon all their former Ministriations. You can't mean, that this is to confess all former Acts of their Ministry *invalid*, and of none effect, because you know they who require this of them do not think so themselves; but if you mean that this will be a tacit Confession, that they were not *regularly* admitted into the *Ministry* before, I do not see why this may not be required of them, and why it should not be easily granted by them, unless they can demonstrate that there has not been such an Order as *Bishops* in the Church, in all Ages of it: And that Ordination is not chiefly, and in the regular Course of Things, *their Office*. This you account hard upon those who were Ordain'd before by *Presbyters*; but how does this affect such as had *Episcopal Ordination*? Or, How is this a Reason for *Dissenting* to those who were to come into the Ministry after the restauration of *Episcopacy*? But 3dly, They must declare their Assent and Consent to all Things in the Liturgy: To the use of all Things, says the Act. But you understand better the intent of that Declaration, than those who require it of you, and will not make it in the Sense of those who impose it, but in your own, which is very unreasonable. 4thly, They must swear Obedience to the Bishops, according to the Canons. Here you refer your Reader, I suppose, to what you have said under your third Argument (p. 118.) where, all you design is, to prove obstinate and open Opposers of the Establish'd Church, excommunicate by the Canons; as we shall see by and by. And how little this refers to the Minister's Obedience to his Bishop, ev'ry one may see. 5ly, They must not Baptize any without the Sign of the Cross, and God fathers, &c. 6thly, Nor give the Lord's-Supper to any that refuse to Kneel. But in the first Place, I desire it may be observed, you lay no Charge here against the *Cross in Baptism*, you have said nothing to the 30th Canon of our Church, which gives the People the true Reasons of prescribing it; you do not advance any thing to shew it *Unlawful* or *Popish*, but only

just mention it. Now, since the Church has given you her Reasons for prescribing it, since the use of it is so carefully fenced, and guarded by her Declarations, that there can be no danger from hence, of an idolatrous and superstitious use of it, why should this be complain'd of? In the next Place the Reader must take care of believing you, when you tell him confidently, that according to our Church, *the Parents must stand by at the Baptism of their Children, as tho' they were not concern'd.* For it is too plain, that this is said merely to serve your present purpose: Are not the *Parents* to procure these *Sureties*? Is this design'd by the Church to render the *Parents* unconcern'd for their Children? Have not the *Parents* indissoluble Obligations upon themselves (on other Accounts) to take care of them? And is not this required of them, and wholly design'd, for the spiritual advantage of the Infant? It is a sad thing that you have indulged your Pens so far as to fill the People's Heads with such groundless Prejudices and Scruples. If you, and other Enemies of our Church had not taken this Method, but on the contrary had sincerely declared (what you seem here to grant) that these Things here mention'd are *lawful in themselves*, the Cry against them could never have risen to any height: For tho' great *Metaphysicians* might possibly study themselves into such an Opinion, yet the *People* could hardly ever (without an *implicit Faith*) be brought to think, that *the imposing Things, lawfull in themselves, makes them unlawfull.* But under this Head, you amuse your Reader with a strange Phrase, *Clogging Christ's Ordinances with new Terms of Communion;* which I must now examine. The *Ordinances* you are speaking of, are *Baptism* and the *Supper of the Lord.* If I understand rightly the meaning of this Phrase, these Sacraments are said to be *clog'd with new Terms of Communion,* in the *Church of England,* because the *People* can never partake in them without some *Condition,* Christ has not made necessary to their partaking in them; for instance, *'They cannot have their Children Baptiz'd, unless they procure God-*

*fathers,*

fathers, and they cannot receive the Communion, unless they *Kneel*, for these two Things only are what you fix this Accusation upon here. This is the utmost I can make of it. Now I desire to know, whether this Hardship is upon the *Ministers*, or the *People*? Chiefly upon the *People* it is plain: And all you can mean with respect to *your selves* is, that you will not have any hand in dealing thus hardly with the *People*, and therefore cannot *conform* as *Ministers*. Now, *First*, *many* of *you* your selves deal as hardly at least with the *People*. I mean *Them*, who expressly require a *New Covenant*, distinct from the *Gospel Covenant*, of their *People*, before they can be admitted to *Communion* with them. You tell us, *Those which you have produced are the common Grounds in which all Dissenters agree*; but if such of you as I am now speaking of, can tax any Church with *clogging Christ's Ordinances with new Terms of Communion*, and make this a Plea for *Nonconformity*, then either I know not what they mean by *new Terms*, or they have little Modesty left. But, *Secondly*, I might appeal to the *People*, if they were not prepossess'd, and *odd Phrases* (which they know not the meaning of) put into their Mouths, and safely venture to make them Judges in their own Case. But as it is, I must turn my self to you. And, pray, what is this mighty hardship? Are *God-fathers* and *God-mothers* unlawful? Or, is *Kneeling* at the *Sacrament* so? No such thing is pretended here. Does the *imposing* these Things make them *unlawful*? You say no such thing, whatever you think, only insinuate something like it in another form of Speech. When the *Governors* of this Church have agreed to require these Things of their *People*, ought they to think this a *hardship*? Ought they not rather to comply with them, than to raise a disturbance in the Church by not complying? If they ought not, let it be plainly shown, and not darkly hinted at in one *odd Expression*. If they ought, what have you to do first to raise, and then to encourage such Weakness and such Scruples in them? Why should you interpose your selves to make their Scruples.

Scuples stronger? Why should you talk of this as a great Hardship upon them, and pretend to minister in *separate Congregations* in order to redress their *Grievances* of this Nature? Doth not the *Church* require *Sureties in Baptism*, and *Kneeling at the Communion*, the one, that the greatest Security may be given for the good Education of the *Children*, and the other, that the sacred Solemnity of the *Lord's Supper* may be perform'd with all Decency, and the most uniform Reverence? And these I think are good Reasons. So that if I were in your place, and had a mind to express this heinous Offence against the People's liberty, I should think my self obliged to avoid such Phrases as you pick out, and as tend only to amuse and prejudice Men's Minds, and to represent it with due regard to the Truth and Original of the Matter. And indeed, if instead of telling your People that the *Church of England* clogs *Christ's Ordinances* with new Terms of Communion, you should have told them, That this *Church* will not permit *Baptism* to be administred to *Children*, unless their *Parents*, besides their own *Obligations*, give such Security for their good Education as God-fathers and God-mothers: nor permit the *Lord's Supper* to be administred to any, who will not take it in a posture of Reverence and Humility: I say, if it had been represented to the People in some such Words, I hardly think they could have been much frighted, or imagin'd their Christian Liberties invaded, or been drawn over to other Teachers, in order to have *Baptism* administred to their *Children* with less Security, or to partake of the *Lord's Supper* with less Decency. Now, supposing you had conform'd as a *Minister*, and whenever there was occasion, should seriously have profess'd to your People thus, *What I require of you in order to Baptism or receiving the Lord's Supper is in obedience to a lawful Authority to which I am accountable.* These *Sureties* were order'd by this *Authority* for a good end, and this *Kneeling* only for Decency, as a reverent and becoming Gesture: And there being no Objections against the things themselves, you ought to consult the Peace and Beauty of this *Church* by complying with them. Do you think you

you should have had any uneasiness upon your Conscience on this account? Or, that if you had all done this, you should not have done the *Church of Christ* more real Service than you can possibly do it, while you divide the *Communions* and Hearts of Christians? Or, that if somewhat like this had been sincerely inculcated upon the People, these Things could ever have been taken for *Oppression*, and *separate Churches* erected for *Cities of Refuge*? But I return to your Charge, and, 7. *Ministers in the Church of England must in effect say, all that are buried are saved, except the Unbaptized, Excommunicate, and Self-murtherers.* This I suppose you ground upon some Sentences in the *Office of Burials*, but very unreasonably. For, in the first place, supposing there are some Passages in that *Office* looking that way, how unjust is it to fix this meaning upon them, when this Church in her publick Offices has declared the contrary more than once in plain and express Words? The same Persons who drew up this Form, drew up the others in that Book, and if they were Men of common Sense (as it is to be hoped they were) they did not mean to contradict in these Places, what they had asserted and implied in several others of the same Book. In the next place, the *Passages* meant here, do not say, or necessarily imply, that the Persons *buried are saved*: As they were not design'd to do this, so they are capable of another Signification. If it be consider'd, that we have nothing to do to judge of particular Men's condition, how little remov'd from *Fear*, and how far from *Confidence*, the lowest degree of *Hope* is, I think we may say, *As our Hope is this our Brother doth*, without being said to determine him to *Salvation*, whatever He has been. Nor can this be thought any Encouragement to a *wicked Life*, when done by a *Church*, that has declared in her publick Offices, and declares by the Sermons of her *Ministers* ev'ry day, the *necessity* of a good Life. As for the other Expression this *Cavil* is founded up-  
*It hath pleased Almighty God of his great Mercy to take unto himself the Soul of our dear Brother here departed*; I think it is very plain,

plain, that there is a real difference, and a distinction made by our Church in this very Office, between Almighty God's *taking the Soul of a Person to himself*, and *taking it to Happiness and Glory*; and that the former is design'd only to signify his taking the Person out of this World, to dispose of him as he shall think fit. He that will not allow this Interpretation to Words that will bear it very well, and that were apparently design'd for no other, may find fault for ever, and cannot possibly be answer'd. Now I, who can allow this, and, as I think, upon just Reasons, can also think it a *Mercy in God* to take both *Good* and *Bad* Men out of this World. The *Good*, because they are taken to Reward. The *Bad*, because I think them *incorrigible*, not to be reform'd by any of the Methods in which God sees fit to deal with Mankind: And tho' they go to Punishment, yet I judge, to a lesser degree of Punishment, than if they had been permitted to live longer here, and add more and greater Sins to their former Catalogue. Therefore I can say, *God, of his great Mercy, hath taken this Person to himself even of a wicked Man*, believing it to be done in Mercy to One, who would only live on to Sin more, and increase his Punishment; but not believing, or saying that *This Man is sav'd*. But farther, If this Objection be founded upon your *Affent* and *Consent* to the use of that Office in which these Sentences are, I desire you to remember, that you give your *Affent* to it, as it is in the Common-Prayer-Book, *viz.* as it supposes *sufficient Discipline* in the Church (which it really does) and with this Supposition you must, I think, acknowledge it a *proper Office*, and lawful to be used. But, if it be founded upon this, that tho' *sufficient Discipline* is not exercis'd, yet you must necessarily in Person read these Passages over *wicked Men* if you minister in our Church; if what has been said cannot satisfy you, I add, that it is great odds but you may escape such a necessity. But if ever there should be this necessity, that you your self, in Person, cannot avoid using this *Form* over *One* who, you are, upon good Grounds, persuaded, died a very *wicked Man*, I think it

it would look better in you, and be more excusable, to omit these Expressions your Conscience does not approve of, let the event be what it will ; than to minister in separate Congregations, and to encourage a *Division* from the Church upon this account. In the one Case you only venture *Suspension for three Months*, and , if it should be executed, you have this Comfort, that it is for doing what you thought your Duty to do, and here is no great mischief done to the *Christian Church*. In the other, there is an apparent Mischief to the Christian Cause, and I doubt, hardly justifiable by so poor an Argument as this, *I must minister in some Church or other* (which is still to be prov'd) *I must therefore separate from the Church of England*, because it is probable that *I cannot officiate in that Church*, without reading some time or other in my Life two Sentences against my Conscience, which if I omit, I run the hazard of *Suspension for three Months*: tho' I may possibly avoid both.

8. Whereas many Canonical Chapters are omitted, the Ministers must read in Publick, Lessons out of the Apocrypha, particularly the Story of Asmodeus, and Bel and the Dragon ; and how these tend to the edification of the People, you do not see. But, pray, show us, how those Canonical Chapters that are omitted, tend to the Edification of the People ; show us, that the Lessons appointed out of the *Apocrypha* are not (generally speaking) most excellent , and most useful ; show us, that in the publick Service of the Church there must not be a Word spoken that does not directly tend to the Edification of the People (and I'm sure this will condemn all the Churches in the World, and your selves too;) show us, that You, who condemn this , do not tell in your Pulpits more ridiculous and useless Stories than that of *Asmodeus*, and *Bel*, at least twice in a whole year ; and, if you can do all this, show us, after all, the force of this Argument; I cannot minister in the Church of *England*, because on *two days* in a *whole Year* there are *two Histories* appointed to be read (not as the Word of God, but as they occur in Books that have been very much esteem'd in the Church) which I do not approve of, and

which I do not see how they tend to the Edification of the People ; tho' on these same Days there are *Lessons* out of the *New Testament*, and ev'ry day sufficient means for their *Edification*. For my part, I am so far from thinking it an Objection against the Church that some *Canonical Chapters* are omitted, that I could rather wish several that are appointed, were omitted also ; nor would I exchange (if I were to judge of the *Edification*, or *real Benefit* of others, by my self) most of those Chapters appointed out of the *Apocrypha*, for any of the *Canonical* ones which, you complain, are omitted. But who could ever have thought (especially after the Churches Declaration about these Apocryphal Lessons) that Men who practise and allow in their Churches Humane *Composures*, many of them made *ex tempore*, according to the present Humour, Fancy, and Disposition of the Preacher , and often full of entertaining *Stories*, should make it an Objection against another Church, that she permits Chapters to be read in Publick out of Books, some of them written by excellent Men, and all of them esteem'd and valued in the *Jewish* and *Christian* Church? *q.**They must excommunicate whomsoever a Lay-Chancellor bids them, &c.* You should have said, They must read and publish the *Excommunications* a *Lay-Chancellor* sends to them, if you would have kept to strictly to *Truth*. But as you have done in other Cases, so you aggravate this, and make it much worse than it is. I do not believe you can produce an Instance of any *Minister*, who ever suffered for delaying the pronouncing the *Excommunication*, till he has search'd into the Reasons, gave the Parties concern'd notice of it, and put 'em into a method of having the Sentence revers'd. This has been, and is, frequently done, and to good purpose often, without incurring any danger. And it is a hard Case, if you will not *minister* in a Church, if there is any thing amiss in the Constitution of it, tho' it is a great chance, whether you shall feel any Inconvenience from it through your whole Life. If this is your *Principle* I doubt you must go out  
of

of the World, or else conform as a *Lay-man*. 10. *They were to renounce the Covenant, &c.* That is, they were to acknowledge that there lay no Obligation upon them to destroy the very Constitution of this State and *Church*, or, to make *such alterations* in them as the *Covenant* engag'd them to make (for the renunciation of this *Covenant* cannot possibly extend any farther than to *such alterations* as were design'd by *this Covenant*) that tho' they had been so weak as to bind themselves by such an Oath, yet that they now thought it so unlawful an Oath, that no considering Person ought to think himself obliged by it. If they did not think this an *unlawful Covenant* (especially when they could not perform it but at the manifest danger of the *publick Peace* again) they were not very fit to be acknowledg'd as *Ministers* in this *Church*. And if they did not think any Obligation lay upon them from it, where was the hardship of declaring this? They were not to renounce it for *others*, so as to signify what others thought, but what they ought to think. This Difficulty is now remov'd, as you confess: And so *this*, and the *following Objection* must for ever be laid aside, as any Reasons for your present *Non-compliance*, whatever they were heretofore. What follows is only a hard Reflexion or two from Dr. *Bates*, upon the *Persons* concern'd in that *Bartholomew-Act*, and the *Savoy-Conferences*, and the *Principles* they acted upon; which, I think, neither *He* nor *You* have any thing to do with. Neither the *Concurrence* of the *Ruling Clergy* in the *Act*, nor the Words he fixes upon Bishop *Sheldon*, prove what he is pleas'd to affirm, that they were instigated by *Wrath and Revenge*: For very good Christians might concur in that *Act*, and speak those Words, from a serious Consideration of the Miseries some sort of Men had already brought upon the Nation, and the reasonableness of taking the greatest Securities from such Persons, for the future *Peace* and *Quiet* of the *Church* and *State*. I am sure, however we our selves suffer, we ought not to give our selves the liberty of fixing the worst and most unchristian Inter-

pretation upon other Men's Words and Actions, when they are capable of a good one. *Another Author* you produce as a Witness of the hardships of this *Act*; but he says nothing to excuse you, but only what tends to cast an Odium upon the *Establishment*, and to widen our Breaches, which it is the part of ev'ry good Man to endeavour to heal. Thus have I gone over the several Reasons you give for your Non-conformity as Ministers: And have, I hope, remark'd under ev'ry one of them, what is sufficient to show, that they are not such very hard *Terms* but that they might have been complied with; but that much harder might have been impos'd, if *Wrath* and *Revenge* had been the *great moving Principles*. I have some few more Observations to make, and then I shall proceed.

1. Of these *eleven Heads of Accusation* you produce, the *Two last* are wholly vanish'd now, and therefore cannot be any of those Reasons which keep out *You* at present.

2. Of the *Nine others* the *First* is founded upon a mistake of your own, for I can find no such Thing required.

3. The *Second* is the only remaining Objection that can be founded upon the *Act of Uniformity*. For the *Third*, or an Objection of the same nature, may be founded upon the 36th *Canon*, by which all Ministers are required to *subscribe*, &c. To the *Second* I have said what is sufficient. I observe therefore;

4. That the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, & 9th, would all have been as effectual Reasons for your *Nonconformity as Ministers*, before that *Act*, as since, being founded upon some Things required of *Ministers then* as well as *now*, upon what the *Old*, as well as *New Church of England*, thought very fit to require of them. Upon which, I desire the *Reader* to call to mind, how little of *Revenge* or *Malice* here could be, upon how serious Deliberation these Things were prescribed, by what great Men they were approved, when it was first thought fit they should be requir'd of all *Ministers*, and therefore the greatest part of the *blame* (if there is any) is to be

be thrown, not upon those who only retain'd them, but upon those who first prescribed them. And what sort of Men *They* were, how wise and prudent, as well as honest and learned, how sollicitous and cautious of doing any thing but what was for the Glory of the Church, and the good of their *People*, is sufficiently known. I do not remark this to insinuate that it is impossible to make any *Alterations* for the better in what *such* Men have done (which they require not of us to think, but rather imply the contrary) but to show, that these are not *new Terms* of *Ministerial Conformity*, that they are not to be dated from 1661. nor to be referr'd to the influence of *wicked and unchristian Principles*. The two last Heads of your Charge give you the most ground for that *Censure*; but I observe

5. They may be very well accounted for, if we consider the great and fatal Disturbances that had laid waste both Church and State, the reasonableness of requiring the greatest Security, in order to prevent the same Miseries, of Persons who were to come into Places, in which they were capable of doing a great deal of Mischief, and in which some, at least, would retain the same Principles of Disturbance: Which leads me

6. To put the *Reader* in mind, how unfairly you deal with him, when you amass together so many Heads of Accusation, and endeavour to cast an *Odium* upon your Governors in *Church* and *State*, without letting him know, or so much as once intimating, that there were the *least Provocations* given, on the other side, when you know there were the *greatest* imaginable; or, so much as *one* Reason for requiring these Things, when you know there are *many* as we think. After I have said thus much, I think, I may leave any impartial Person to judge, whether these *Terms* are so very hard, that good and considering Men might not easily have conform'd to them, and prevented that *Ejection* and *Deprivation* so much complain'd of. You proceed now to the *Second* part of your Argument, viz. *That the Ministers being*

being ejected by the Imposition of these Terms, it was the Duty of the People to adhere to them, and their Successors, and sinful to forsake them, and join with the Conformists.

For the proof of this, you alledge no plain Argument drawn from the Words of Scripture, or from the Peace and Union of the Church; but all the Arguments you produce (tho' you tell us, they were *the good old Presbyterian Arguments*) are taken from an *Author*, whose Principles you will acknowledge to be good for nothing, as *He* manages them: And yet, as *You* manage them, I believe *He* himself will acknowledge them good for nothing. The *First Argument* you borrow, is taken from Ecclesiastical History, as if you would make us believe your People had great Skill in *Precedents*, and stuck close to you, when you were ejected, because *a considerable number of the Inhabitants of Constantinople, after the unjust Deposition of John Chrysostom, refus'd to communicate with his Successor*. It is very hard to build so great a part of *Christian Duty*, and that so nearly concerns many ordinary and unlearned People, upon a remote piece of *History*, they cannot be supposed to know, but as *Learned Men* think fit to dish it out to them. And what will become of this Argument, when another *Learned Man* comes, and produces many more Instances of *Christian People* communicating with a Bishop, even supposing his Predecessor was *unlawfully ejected*? The *Second Argument* you borrow is taken from *thereason of the thing*. But, in short, if the only Reason, why these Arguments are not good for *your Author's purpose*, and yet very good for *yours*, is, as you tell us, *because you were ready to give the State all reasonable Security for your Loyalty, which his Friends were not*, then you effectually acknowledge *a Power in the State to deprive and eject Ecclesiastical Persons* upon some Occasions (as in the Case of the *Non-jurors*) and that upon these Occasions their Obligation to a publick Discharge of their Ministry ceaseth, and their relation to their Flocks is destroy'd. Now, if this be so, then it is plain (according to your self) *a less Power can vacate their Commission than the Power that gave it*,

it, which you say is absurd. Then also, upon some Occasions, the State can alienate *Holy Persons* who are dedicated to God's special Service: which you say cannot be done. But certainly, you are not sensible your self, how you manage this part of your Cause. You make use of Arguments, which, if they prove any thing, certainly destroy such a Power in the State on *all Occasions*, as well as *some*; and yet you acknowledge such a Power in it on *some Occasions*. Your Reasonings cannot be used against this Power any where but in the State; and yet you say the same Reasonings prove no such Power in the *Church*. That is, you argue *First* that *a less Power* (as you term that of the State) *cannot stop their Commission, than that which gave it*; and thence you infer, *That the same Power that gave it, cannot*; which is very pretty. As if, because what has no Power to give, has no Power to take away, therefore that which has Power to give, has none likewise to take away. But because you do in Truth acknowledge, against the Arguments you produce, that there is such a Power in our State upon *some Occasions*, Therefore, my Business is to consider the Justice of what you say, *That your Ministers were ready to give the State all reasonable Security for their Loyalty, therefore they were unlawfully ejected, and not oblig'd to obey that State which required of them, either to comply with these Terms, or to forbear the exercise of their Ministry.* This is quite another Argument than what you can form out of the *Author* you are now transcribing. In Reply to it I desire to know, 1. Whether you do not own that a State is to be obey'd *sometimes* when it requires this? I think you do, when the *Non-jurors* are concern'd, and therefore you do not deny but that there may be an Obligation upon you to forbear your publick Ministry, in obedience to the State; much more, we think, when the Governors both of State and *Church*, require it. 2. This being so, Whether, if the State should chance to be mistaken, and not think those *Terms unreasonable*, which You do, this dissolves all your Obligation to Obedience to it? 3. What is

reasonable Security? The State, one would think, was a proper Judge of that, and the State thought it but a reasonable Security that you should renounce a Covenant, by which you had obliged your selves (as was thought) to disturb the Peace of it. This You refus'd; and therefore I do not see how you can sincerely say, *You were ready to give all reasonable Security.* But, 4. How come *You* to be the *Pastors* of the People? And how come *the relation between the ejected Bishops and Clergy, and their People to be dissolved*, according to *your Self*? Can none be *unlawfully ejected* but *your selves*? This I shall mention again by and by: it only puts me in mind at present, that there was a *Church* and *Bishops* formerly settled here, and violently ejected, now to be restored, and to these some *Security* was due. But as you refus'd to give what was thought *reasonable* to the *State*, so you did likewise to this returning *Church*. If these *Questions* were fairly answer'd, the *Argument* which gave occasion to them would be answer'd likewise. Having thus examin'd what you alledge for the Proof of your *Second Argument*,

I come now, *Secondly*, to represent it to the Reader in its full force, and so to observe to him several Things to be prov'd before it can do you any Service. The Argument is this,

*It is sinful in the People to forsake their Pastors ejected from their Livings by the Imposition of unreasonable Terms.*

The *Dissenting Ministers* were such *Pastors*, and their *Successors* are to be esteem'd as having the same relation to their *Flocks*.

Therefore the People were obliged in the Year 1662. to adhere to them, and they, and *other People* have been ever since obliged to stick to *Them*, and their *Successors*.

This is the mighty Argument upon which you are so bold as to venture the whole *Charge of Schism*, and this is your mighty

mighty design in mustering up so many Terms of *Ministerial Conformity* to defend the *Nonconformity of the Laity*. Now if I can show that there are several Things absolutely necessary to be prov'd, before this Argument can do you any Service, and some of these such as can never be prov'd (as I believe) then it will appear that the Challenge you here make is not very prudent, and that so great a Man as Bishop *Stillingfleet* cannot be suppos'd to have wav'd the Consideration of the Case of your *Ministers*, because he thought your Argument for Separation taken from thence was unanswerable, as you insinuate. The principal Things which you must prove, before this *Argument* can do you any Service, are these, which you have all this while *taken for granted*.

1. That your Ministers were truly the *Pastors* of the People, whereas it must be granted, that they who had a better Title to this, had been violently ejected, before *your Ministers* could pretend to be their *Pastors*; and therefore, if you will not allow them who succeed *your ejected Ministers*, to be truly their *Pastors*, how can you think *your Ministers* truly their *Pastors*, who succeeded the *ejected Bishops*? 2. That the *Terms* required of them were *unreasonable*, which I have endeavour'd to show they were not. 3. That supposing they thought them *unreasonable*, it had been a Sin in them to have forborn the publick Exercise of their Ministry, and was so in those who did it. Or, That it had been a Sin in them, if instead of setting up *separate Congregations*, they had conform'd themselves as Laymen, and employ'd all their Abilities in their Conversation to have made Men betrer Christians, and have hinder'd these Heats and Divisions amongst us. 4. That their *People* did really stick to them, because they were perluaded they were their true *Pastors*, and not for *Edification*, not because they lik'd their Way, their Voice, their manner of Preaching better than the *Conformists*, for, if they did not adhere to them upon this Principle, this *Argument* signifies nothing to *their Vindication*; and if any other Reason (as, the liking others better, or the desire of

better Edification) will excuse them, then you can never prove, that they Sin'd who forsook your ejected Ministers, and join'd with the Conformists (as you say they did) for the same Excuse will serve for them, supposing they forsook their true *Pastors*. 5. That your Ministers did not, many of them, themselves recommend to their People (at their parting) Attendance and Respect to those who were to come in their room, and advised them against *Dissensions* and *Separations*: Or, that they Sin'd in doing this. 6. That the People to whom the ejected Ministers preach'd, and of whom their Congregations were made up, were none but such as were their *Flock* before, to whom they had contracted the relation of *Pastors*: Otherwise this Argument signifies nothing; and I dare say this is false of ev'ry particular dissenting Congregation in the whole Land. 7. That these Ministers not only were obliged in Duty to take care of their People, but were also obliged to ordain others to succeed them in this *separate Ministry*, which is not at all plain. 8. That You who were ordain'd by these Ministers, and succeed them in their Ministry, have the same People to whom they had the relation of *Pastors* when they were ejected; or, if not the very same, yet such as They would have that same relation to, were they alive; or, that the relation you have to your Congregations now is all founded upon the *relation* your Predecessors had to these same Congregations when they were ejected. You know that any Persons are taken into your Congregations, whencesoever they come, and whatsoever *Pastor* they have a relation already to: And yet you talk here, as if you plac'd the whole Strength of your Cause upon the indissoluble relation between the *Pastor* and his *People*. These Things, and several others must be plainly proved, before this Argument can do you any Service, and these are too material Things for You to take for granted, or, for Us to grant, without the least shadow of a Proof. But,

*Thirdly*, I will show that if the *Principles* upon which you argue are true, they make very much against your *Selves*: and that briefly thus. It

It is sinful in the *People* to forsake their *Pastors*, illegally, and violently ejected. The *Bishops* and *Presbyters* which were settled in the Land, before *your Ministers*, were their *Pastors*, and unlawfully ejected. Therefore, the *People* were bound to adhere to them, were bound not to join with *your Ministers*, who came into their Places, and if they had join'd with them, to return to their *Bishops*, when they were restored.

If *You* had this relation to the *People*, how much more *They*, who were ejected before you? If *You* were *unlawfully* ejected, how much more *They*? If *your Relation* to the *People* could not be dissolved by your being *ejected*, how come *Theirs* to be dissolved? Or, will you not suffer the same Principles to be good, when they are urg'd *against* your selves, which you magnify so, when you urge them *for* your selves? So much for your *Second Argument*.

What follows, p. 117. is what the impartial Reader will acknowledge may justly be call'd a very rude, vain and senseless Threatning, and therefore deserves no farther Consideration.

Your *Third Argument* is taken from the *Canons*, which, you say, *force you away from the Church*. But, 1. If a Church has any Authority to prescribe any *Forms and Ceremonies*, certainly it has Authority to preserve them from being openly revil'd, abused, and reproach'd. 2. Whatever you say, These *Canons* were made against none but such as *reproach* our Constitution, and are *obstinate in affirming* these Things to the disturbance of the Peace and Quiet of the Church, not against those, who only think some Things in it had better be alter'd, or declare it, with due Respect, upon a good occasion. You say the *Cross* in Baptism is *unlawful*. I confess I never saw an Argument against it yet, that I should think could possibly determine a wise Man to think so; and *You do not attempt to tell us what makes you think so*. You talk of *Lay-Chancellors*, and their laying about them, as if you had never troubled your self to enquire any thing of the Mat-

( 68 )

ter, but was resolv'd to aggravate it as much as possible. You say, *You find no such Bishop as ours in Scripture, &c.* But can all your Heads put together show that such a Superiority of *one* over *many* Presbyters, as we maintain, is *repugnant to the Word of God*, which is the Point before us now? And supposing you think all this, are these such great Grievances, that you must sacrifice the Peace of the Church to your Zeal against them? 4. Did the Persons you pretend to follow, in whose time these *Canons* were made, think them any Argument for setting up distinct and separate Churches? Did they not rejoice in such a *Church* as ours, and always plead for tolerating what you could not *amend* in it? 5. Is not this *Excommunication*, as it stands in the *Canons*, as good an Argument against *Occasional Communion*, as *Constant*? And if you cannot communicate with us *constantly*, as you here pretend, because you are *excommunicated*, how can you communicate with us *occasionally*? Yet you seem to plead for that, and at the same time make this Argument from the *Canons* alone sufficient to prove you cannot have *Communion* with us. To what you quote under this Head from Dr. *Sherlock*, you should have added the Words that immediately follow in him, *viz.* *But this I submit to the Judgment of my Superiors*, and then the Reader would neither have wonder'd at what he says, nor at your unfair dealing with him.

For your *Fourth Argument you urge the State of Church-Discipline amongst us.* But, 1. If there is any defect in this, you may urge it, and plead against it, and complain of it, with the Authority of the *Church* on your side, and perhaps more effectually, without dividing your selves into *separate Churches*. 2. What great *Discipline* have *You* among you, which we want? Is it exercis'd better, and more to the advantage of Christians in all your separate Churches, than it may be at this day by a *Minister* in the *Church of England*, who honestly doth his Duty? 3. This is not a good Argument, *There is a defect in the Discipline of this Establish'd Church, therefore I may lawfully set up, and encourage separate Assemblies,*

semblies, and divide the Communions and Hearts of Christians; yet you make the People believe it is. 4. As for the resolute opposition to Christian Discipline in this Church you speak of, I dare say this is a Device of your own. However, you may by Conforming make a Party against this prevailing Party you speak of, and pray, and write for a Reformation in this with greater Success, than in the way you have took: And that, without sinfully giving up what your Fathers thought worth contending for, tho' you pretend you cannot. To contend for Discipline is one thing, and to divide the Church for it is another, the one commendable, the other inexcusable; much more, to divide from a Church for it, and yet want it as much as that Church does too. And if your Fathers thought Discipline worth purchasing at this Price, I dare say, your Grandfathers did not.

---

### The CONCLUSION.

**V**OUR Conclusion consists of Three Things, which, I suppose, you think very considerable, and therefore I shall examine them.

1. To the First. By the Position you mention, we mean that where there is a *Church of Christ* settled, there we are not to separate from the Communion of it, if we can enjoy it without Sinning, under the pretence of a *better Church*, or *greater Edification*, or any such Plea; because this lays a Foundation for eternal Divisions: Nor should you above all Men, insinuate that the People may do this, who have before so peremptorily concluded all those to have Sinned, who forsook your *ejected Ministers*, and join'd with the *Conformists* in 1661. for this one Reason, because They were their *Pastors*, and a relation contracted between the People and *Them*. Now, if the People may go from their *Pastors* under pretence

tence of a better Church, and better Edification, let one who forsook your Ministers then, argue thus, *I join'd with the Conformists, for the sake of what I account a better Church, and better Edification.* And if you allow this, what signifies all your Second Argument? If you do not allow it in *Him*, why do you here allow it in *your own People*? Either the *one* Plea or the *other* must be laid aside. But were they both good and consistent Arguments, as you have fail'd in the *one*, so I am certain you would in the *other*, *viz.* If you went about to shew better Churches, and better Edification among You, than among Us. As to the former, *you* would name one Church, another *Dissenter* would name another, and so the *People* must be distracted for ever. As to the latter, you must know, that there is nothing so absurd, so useless, so contrary to the main design of the *Gospel*, but that great numbers of the *People* can be pleas'd with it better than with grave, substantial, reasonable Instructions, and mistake it for better Edification.

To your Second. The Argument we urge you with is this. If you can communicate with us upon some Occasions, and join with us in our Religious Offices now and then, it is your Duty to join with us always, and a Sin to divide into separate Communions. That is, it is your Duty to consult the Beauty and Peace of the Church, since you can do it by doing that *always* which you think very lawful to do *sometimes*: and it is a Sin to deform and disturb the Church by Separation, since you may enjoy Communion in Religious Offices without sinning against your Consciences. Now you invert this Argument, and ask Us how this looks? Constant Communion with the Church of England is a Sin, therefore so is Occasional. I do not see but that it looks very well, and the Consequence what we grant. Constant Communion is only doing *always* what you do *sometimes*, if you exercise Occasional Communion. Now, as the lawfulness of doing this Action once proves (as we think) the Lawfulness, and therefore the Duty, of repeating it, and doing it *always*; so the unlawfulness

ness of doing it *always*, will certainly prove the unlawfulness of doing it *once*: And yet this will prove nothing against *Us*, who desire you to communicate with us constantly, and not now and then; but against *your Selves*, who allow *Occasional*, and condemn *Constant Communion* with us. I leave out that part of your Argument about *Partial and Total Communion*, because I do not understand exactly what you mean, and because your *Occasional Communion* does, I think, frequently extend to *Prayer, Hearing, and Sacraments*: Which is sufficient to our present purpose.

To the *Third and Last*, I answer. God grant us all Minds disposed to *Peace and Union*! If you, for your parts, truly desire an agreement, the best way of showing it would be, not by Writing such *bitter* and *violent* Books as this, but by laying down your Prejudices, by submitting as far as you acknowledge you can without *Sin*, by *tolerating* what you cannot *amend*, by professing sincerely to your *People*, that the *Terms of Communion* required of *them* are lawful, and arguing as you would argue if *you* were the *Establish'd Church*. This would be an easy Step towards *Peace*, for some of you. But the Business of *Alterations* is difficult and hazardous, not to be done in answer to all your Demands without making this *Church* the Scorn and Derision of all about it, and as odd a Constitution, as the various and unaccountable Fancies of our several *Dissenters* must make it; that is, without giving much juster occasion for *Separation* than any you can plead now. If any such thing is ever attempted, it must be founded wholly upon a Principle of *making the Church in it self better, and more perfect*, at least, *not worse, and more imperfect*. And it cannot be expected that the Measures for doing this should be taken from the Mistakes and Prejudices of *Enemies*, but from the serious Counsels of those whose Business it is to consider, and consult the Beauty, Advantage, and true Interest of it.

Thus

Thus have I followed you through your whole Treatise, and have, according to my Abilities, given the World some Account of your performance. What I have said, has proceeded from no ill Principle or ill Design, but from a Persuasion, that something ought to be said in the Vindication of a *Great Man*, whom you had misrepresented and abused ; and in opposition to a most *unreasonable Separation*, from the *Best Church* we know of in the World. Whether I have done this, as it should be, the Reader must judge.




---

F I N I S.

---

